CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS ON BOOKS, ANTIENT and MODERN.

VOL. II.

ARTICLES.

Conjectures concerning the Meaning of the Word Venta, in Roman Names of Cities in Britain.

Remarks on the Tranſlation of a Paſſage concerning the Dates of a lunar Eclipſe, in Ibn. Younes's Hiſtory of Celeſtial Obſervations.

Remarks on Mr. Richardſon's Diſſertation on the Literature of Eaſtern Nations, ſo far as reſpects Jewiſh and Perſian Hiſtory.

Doubts concerning the Tranſlation and Notes of the Biſhop of London to Iſaiah, vindicating Ezechiel, Iſaiah, and other Jewiſh Prophets from Diſorder in Arrangement.

LONDON:

Sold by B. WHITE, in FLEET-STREET.

MDCCLXXXIII.

CRITICAL

OBSERVATIONS

ON

BOOKS,

ANTIENT and MODERN.

VOL. II.

CMC
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM

Conjectures concerning the origin and meaning of the word Venta *in Roman names of cities in Britain, alſo concerning ſeveral other antient names: In oppoſition to the explanations of Mr. Whitaker in his Hiſtory of Mancheſter, and of the Hon. Daines Barrington, in the fourth volume of Archæologia.*

THERE are two words among the Roman names of cities in Britain, the meaning of which had been long ſubject to doubt, namely *Iſca* and *Venta*; and I may add alſo a third in ſome degree, that of *Vara*: the ſenſe of *Iſca*, however, has been now clearly aſcertained, firſt in Gibſon's additions to Camden, at article *Brecknock*, and ſince confirmed by Dr. Macpherſon, in his *Critical Diſſertations*, p. 126; the meaning of *Vara* has been alſo tolerably gueſſed at: but *Venta* is ſtill as much ſubject to all the wantonneſs of conjecture as the name of *Britain* itſelf. The reaſon of this has been, becauſe the origin of theſe words has been ſought for either in the Hebrew, Phœnician or Welſh languages; whereas the clear explanation of *Iſca** and *Vara*† from the Iriſh, points out

* Whether the river *Iſca* took its name from *Iſcaw*, which ſignifies in Britiſh [Welch] *Elders*, I cannot tell,

that it is to the ſame tongue we muſt have recourſe for the etymology both of *Venta*

tell, or as ſome derive it from *reeds*, which the Britains [Welch] call *Heſk*. Camden, *Devonſhire*.

The Britiſh [Welch] name of the river *Uſk* is *Wyſk*, but *Wyſk* is not at preſent ſignificative in the Britiſh; but it is ſtill preſerved in the Iriſh tongue, and is their common word for *water*. *Gibſon's Add. to Brecknock*.

Certain it is, that the meaning of many Celtic words, which have been preſerved by the Roman writers, and particularly names perſonal and local, the ſignification of which has confounded our beſt antiquaries, may be eaſily diſcovered by thoſe who are no more than indifferently converſant in the Galic. Thus the word *Iſca*, once ſo common in South Britain, ſignifies plainly *water* and *river* in the Galic and Iriſh: the Welch have loſt the ſignification and almoſt the uſe of the word, which is *Uiſce* in the languages juſt mentioned, and *Wyſk* in that of the old Kymri. For that reaſon Camden was not able to find out the meaning of Iſca. *Dr. Macpherſon Crit. Diſſert.* p. 126.

† I have formerly ſuppoſed that *Varia*, in the old Britiſh, ſignified *a paſs*. *Camden, Flintſhire*.

I can add nothing in confirmation of Camden's conjecture; nor can I perceive on what grounds he firſt ſuſpected it: however I dare not aſſign any other, as not knowing any Britiſh [Welch] word, that comes near to it, except *Gwair*, which having no other ſignification than *hay*, makes little to our purpoſe. *Gibſon's Additions*. But that Camden's conjecture was nearly juſt may be confirmed from names in the Scotch erſe. *In-ver*, often contracted into *inner*, is a name repeatedly given to a town, which ſtands near the mouth of a loch or river, as *In-ver-ary*, *In-ver-neſs*, *In-ver-lochy*, *In-ver-ſhin*, *In-verawn*, &c.

Innis

and *Britain* itſelf: and they all prove ſufficiently that the Welch was not the moſt early language in this iſland, but rather the Iriſh; theſe names having been formed by the Greeks and Romans from the language of the inhabitants in thoſe ages, and the original roots of two of them being ſtill in vulgar uſe in the Iriſh and Scotch-erſe, although totally unknown to the Welſh tongue. Hence they, who confound together *Britiſh* and *Welch*, as ſynonimous, fall into a variety of errors. That *Wyſk* ſhould be a name ſtill given by the Welch to a river, and yet not ſignificative, is a certain proof that the Welch never had any ſuch word as *Uiſce* in their language; for we can never reaſonably ſuppoſe, that through time they could have loſt the generic name of that common object *water*, as Dr. Macpherſon idly imagines: that this name *Wyſk* therefore ſhould be found appropriated in Wales to a particular river, is almoſt a certain proof that Wales was formerly inhabited by Iriſh tribes, who left this name behind; which the Welch preſerved, juſt as the Saxons preſerved relics of the ſame Iriſh

Innis and *In* ſtrictly mean an iſland; and in Welch, *any flat ſituation* (Archæol. v. 2. 11.) what the ſtrict ſenſe of *ver* is I cannot determine, but there cannot be any doubt of its being the root of *Vara*.

words in the preſent names *Ex*, *Ox*, *Ouſe*, *Uſk*, *Iſis*.* The Welch then were probably one of the colonies from Belgic Gaul, which, as Tacitus informs us, had ſettled in the ſouthern parts of the iſland, and whom he diſtinguiſhes from the native Britiſh, who probably ſpoke nearly the ſame language as the Iriſh, Scotch-erſe and Pictiſh. Accordingly the name *Cymri*, by which the Welch call themſelves, points out manifeſtly their derivation from the antient *Cimbri*, of Gaul in Roman ſtory. Ricardus alſo, upon what authority we are ignorant, places the Cimbri of Britain, not in Wales, which Tacitus makes to have been inhabited by *Silures*, but on the north parts of Devonſhire, on the borders of the Severn†;

* Many other names in Wales are, doubtleſs, equally without ſignification, and owing to the ſame cauſe: ſo that when antiquaries attempt to explain all Welch names by that language, they make as bad work of it as Varro did of Latin, when he ſought for the meaning of all Roman words in his own tongue, inſtead of ſearching for them in Greek, Tuſcan, Gauliſh and Oriental tongues.

† In hoc brachio, quæ intermiſſione Uxellæ amnis Heduorum regioni protenditur, ſita erat regio Cimbrorum: utrum ne vero modernum Walliæ nomen dederint, an vero antiquior ſit Cimbrorum origo, non æque conſtat?—Ultra Cimbros extremum inſulæ angulum incolebant Carnabii. *De Situ Britanniæ. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *ſect.* 16. And in the annexed map he gives them the ſame ſituation.

over

over which river they probably paſſed into Wales, during the wars with the Romans or Saxons, as being the ſtronger country for defence; and received among from time to time ſuch of the Britons as fled to them for refuge, or were willing to join in defence of their common liberty. The name *Gaul*, which, according to Dr. Macpherſon, denotes in Iriſh and Erſe *foreigner* and *enemy*, and which was equally given to the Welch as to others, again confirms that the Britons and Iriſh conſidered themſelves as a very diſtinct people from the *Cimri*, and other colonies which came from Gaul. The language alſo of the Picts, which he rightly mentions as having been very little different from that of the Iriſh and Scotch erſe, but all three very different from the Welch, again proves that the laſt were not deſcended from the native Britons; for the Picts were undoubtedly genuine remains, and indeed the only ones of the original inhabitants of Britain during Roman times, p. 97. The object then of theſe *conjectures* is to induce thoſe who are ſkilled in the Iriſh or Scotch erſe, to ſearch in thoſe languages for the meaning of the Roman word *Venta*, in the names of the three cities ſo called in Britain, *Venta Belgarum* (Wincheſter) *Venta Icenorum* (Norwich) and *Venta Silurum* (Chepſtow in Monmouthſhire): which

which although, poſſibly, not ſo general there now as the roots of *Iſca* and *Vara*, yet by attention may probably be diſcovered: and in order to aſſiſt in their enquiries, I ſhall throw together a few remarks concerning circumſtances in the ſituation of theſe three cities, in which they all agree, and which therefore may poſſibly have given riſe to their common appellation; but which may alſo hereby point out to an enquirer into Iriſh etymology, how to ſelect the right word among ſeveral, which may probably form almoſt equal pretenſions.

It is ſufficient merely to mention, that by ſome antiquaries *Venta* has been derived from the Latin words *ventus* or *vinum*; which derivations although exploded by Camden, are nevertheleſs, in caſe they be formed from the Welch, juſt as much juſtified by the correſpondent names in Welch, *Gwynt* and *Gwin*,* as that of Leland, which he prefers, from the Welch *Guin* or *Guen* (white) "becauſe all three, as he ſays, are ſituated in a ſoil of chalk and whitiſh clay." But the truth is, that we muſt not look to the Welch for their meaning; neither if we did, is it true, that *Venta Icenorum* was ſituated in ſuch a ſoil;

* See Archæologia, Vol. II. p. 11.—Gibſon's Add. Monmouthſhire. (B)

for

for ſcarcely any ſuch thing as chalk or white clay is to be found in the neighbourhood; but rather, in general, riſing grounds of ſand, gravel and light ſoil, or elſe low and flat meadows of a muddy earth. Mr. Whitaker, not ſeeming ſatisfied with Camden's derivation, has conjectured that *Venta* and *Penta* have the ſame meaning in Welch, the *v*, *b* and *p* being often changed into each other; and that theſe cities were ſo called becauſe they were the *heads* or *chief* cities of their ſeveral diſtricts. But beſides the reference here to the Welch again, we are ignorant that theſe were the chief of ſeveral cities; or, if they were, we have no corroborative indication that chief cities were ſo denominated; and it ſhould rather ſeem not; for otherwiſe why ſhould not more cities, and ſome in the northern parts be called the ſame? The ſame objection of a Welch derivation may perhaps be made to Mr. Barrington's ſenſe of *La-vant* from Bullet's Celtic Dict. Gibſon obſerves, "that the Engliſh names of *Wentſett* and *Wentland* have their origin from the Britiſh word *Gwent*; whereby almoſt all Monmouthſhire, and part of Glouceſterſhire and Herefordſhire were called: but it ſeems queſtionable, whether that name *Gwent* be owing to the city *Venta*; or whether the Romans might not call this city

Venta

Venta Silurum, as well as that of the *Iceni*, and that other of the *Belgæ*, from *Gwent*, the more antient Britiſh name of part of their countries"*. But he does not inform us whether this word *Gwent* be now in Welch ſignificative or not; I conceive that it is not; and that it is the ſame word, which ſometimes appears in Welch names under the varied forms of *Ghennith*, and others, which are equally without ſignification†. Hence another proof ariſes, that many names in Wales had been affixed by ſome other Celtic nation, who had inhabited that country before the *Cymri*; which names were preſerved by the Belgic Cimbri, who ſucceeded: for nothing can be a ſurer proof of any people not being the original inhabitants of a country, than by their retaining,

* *Artic.* Monmouth at (E).

† "Caerphyli hundred is called the hundred of *Senghennith* in Welch; and the north gate of Caerdiff town [in Glamorganſhire] which leads towards Caerphyli is now called *Porth Senghennith*; and the inhabitants of Lantriſant term the eaſt wind *Gwynt Senghennith*, or Senghennith wind, as blowing from that hundred. Whence it had this appellation of Senghennith I am at a loſs to judge, unleſs it were from St. Kenneth or Chineth (Chinedus) from whom *Langennith*, in the weſt of this county, where he lived retired and erected a little monaſtery, and was canonized, took its name." *Harris's Obſerv. on Monmouthſhire* in *Archæologia*. Vol. II.

as in England, the unmeaning words of a dead language for proper names of places. On the contrary, in the Highlands of Scotland, the name of every hill, rock, river and town is ſignificative, either of black, white, red, bog, wood or ſome other peculiar property, which helps to diſtinguiſh it from others: not that I conclude hence in favour of Mr. Macpherſon, whom Mr. Whitaker oppoſes, any farther, than that the nations, who inhabited Britain (except the Belgæ in the ſouth of it) ſpoke a language more nearly reſembling to the Iriſh and Scotch erſe, than to the Belgic Welch; poſſibly it might have been the very ſame as the Pictiſh; therefore the whole of it is now extinct; yet it was not ſo much diſſimilar from the two firſt, but that they may ſtill help us to the meaning, and to a natural etymology of various words, which are in vain deduced from the Welch by all the torture of conjecture. We have found this fact true in reſpect to *Iſca* and *Vara*; it remains for others to examine, whether it be not equally true with reſpect to *Venta* and *Gwent*: But that the Romans formed the names of their three cities *Venta* from the Britiſh name of the diſtrict, whatever it was originally, and which ſtill remains under the form of *Gwent* in the caſe of Venta Silu-

rum, ſeems to follow from the following proofs.

Firſt, If it had been the Saxons, who formed the name *Went* or *Gwent* from the Roman name of the city *Venta*, it would ſcarcely have been found ſubſiſting the ſame alſo in the Welch appellation of any one of theſe cities. But we learn from Nennius (or his tranſcriber Samuel at leaſt) that the Welch called one of theſe cities *Caer-guent* (c. 65.) even in his time, as that in Monmouthſhire is ſtill called by them: now the Welch names of the reſt of the cities in that chapter have no ſimilitude to the Saxon names of the ſame, nor yet to their Roman names, except where the Romans formed their names from thoſe of the natives. As the Saxon name of *Wentſett* muſt have therefore been later than the Welch name *Gwent*; ſo the latter muſt have been prior alſo to the Roman name *Venta*; otherwiſe how ſhould it be found ſubſiſting likewiſe in other Welch names at a diſtance from the city *Venta Silurum*? For inſtance, can any one abſtain from conjecturing that Sen-ghennith in a preceeding note is formed from the ſame Britiſh word as *Gwent*? If it be conſidered that the hundred ſo called in Glamorganſhire extends from north to ſouth all along the weſt border of Monmouthſhire; which

we

we know was, and ſtill is named *Gwent*. Poſſibly *Lan-genneth*, in the weſt of the firſt county, may be derived from the ſame word, and St. Chineth rather from the name of the place, as was cuſtomary in former times, and not contrarywiſe: there was poſſibly another diſtrict called *Gwent*, adjoining to that town likewiſe, and now corrupted into * *Swanſey*, which has great reſemblance to *Wantſua*. There is no reaſon to ſuppoſe that *Sen*, the firſt word of the compound, had any reference to *Saint*; it occurs again in the name of the adjacent hundred *Lan-triſ-ſent*: a town alſo of the very ſame name is found in Angleſea; both probably of the ſame origin as the Roman name *Triſanton* in the channel. *Sent* alſo occurs in *Llanpymſent* and *Kilſant* in Caermarthenſhire, whatever it may ſignify. In North Wales again we find remains of the ſame Britiſh word, namely, in the province called ſtill in Welch *Gwynedh*; in Latin *Guinethia* or *Gwenedia*, or *Guoienit* as it is called in Nennius,† now corrupted into *Flint*, which had apparently their derivation from the ſame Britiſh word with *Gwent*, as

* See p. 16.

† "Ad illam regionem, quæ vocatur *Guoienit* pervenerunt." *Cap.* 40. Gale obſerves, that the Cott. MS. reads *Guent* here. In other places, Nennius and Ricardus render it in Latin by *Guenedotia*, *Venedotia*, *Wenedotia* and *Guennenſis*.

we ſhall find many reaſons to confirm. Now as all theſe names appear to be equally inſignificative in the preſent Welch language, this is almoſt a certain ſign that they had been all impoſed by the Britons, before the Cymri became inhabitants of that country. Gibſon acknowledges the ſame concerning *Meneu* the name of the channel ſeparating Wales from the Iſle of Man*.

Secondly, the name of another diſtrict in England will both again prove, that *Gwent* is of Britiſh extraction antecedent to Roman times, and alſo aſſiſt in diſcovering to us what the word might poſſibly mean. We are informed by Bede, that the channel which ſeparates the iſland of Thanet from Kent, was in his time called *Vantſumu*. Ricardus calls it *Wantſua*: the river near the *Venta Icenorum* is alſo ſtill at this day called *Wentſar* or *Wentſum*; there is ſuch a ſimilarity both in the three names, and alſo in the circumſtances of their ſituation, that I think no one can reaſonably doubt theſe names being all derived from the ſame Britiſh word†.

* "The original ſignification of *Meneu* is now loſt and perhaps not to be retrieved." *Additions to Pembroke* (B). Remains of the ſame name are found in other parts.

† Eſt autem ad Orientalem Cantii plagam Tanetos inſula non modica,—quam a Continenti terra ſecernit fluvius *Vantſumu*, qui eſt latitudinis circiter trium ſtadiorum

In regard to the laſt, this indeed is alſo liable to the doubt ſtarted by Gibſon in the foregoing article, whether that name of the river may not be derived from the Roman name of the city *Venta* in its neighbourhood, rather than the Roman name from the common Britiſh name both of the city, river and diſtrict: but with reſpect to *Wantſua* in Kent, there can be no room for ſuch a doubt, becauſe there never was any Roman city named *Venta* in the neighbourhood. This example then determines the queſtion concerning all the three cities, and ſhews, that whatever relics of names, having any ſimilarity to *Venta*, are found in the neighbourhood of any of them, they are not to be conſidered as relics of the Roman name, but the Roman together with the reſt, as

ſtadiorum et duobus tantum in locis eſt tranſmeabilis: utrumque enim caput protendit in mare. *Hiſtor. Eccles. c.* 25.

Thanatos inſula alluitur freto Oceani, a Britanniæ continente æſtuario tenui, *Wantſuam* dicto, ſeperata. *Ricardus Monachus lib.* 1. *c.* 8. *ſect.* 21.

The *Yare* has not run much toward the eaſt, till a little river *Wentſum* (by others called *Wentſer*) empties itſelf into it from the ſouth: higher up in the ſame river formerly ſtood *Venta Icenorum. Camden Norfolk.*

Camden is miſtaken here; it is the north and chief river, running thro' Norwich, which is ſtill called *Wentſer*, and not the little river which empties into it from the ſouth and below Norwich.

being

being all relics of the more antient Britiſh name. But this preſent example aſſiſts us alſo ſtill farther, by giving us ſome foundation for a conjecture concerning the meaning of the name. For we know, that in Roman times the channel between Thanet and the reſt of Kent was at high water ſo full and deep, that it was the common paſſage for ſhips into the Thames. In like manner there was formerly a broad lake of freſh water at leaſt, if not alſo of ſea-tide, which extended from Norwich to the ſea, before the ſands at Yarmouth had been thrown up by the ſea in ſuch quantity as to obſtruct the tide from entering the mouth of the river: the Danes are ſaid to have come up to Norwich in their ſhips, and landed there. So again the *Venta Silurum* was ſituated near the broad channel of the Severn; and the diſtrict called *Gwent* extends on both ſides of that channel. The *Venta Belgarum* alſo was not far from the broad bay of the ſea which runs into the land near Southampton; the whole adjacent diſtrict alſo might poſſibly have been formerly called *Gwent*, as well as the city Wincheſter itſelf, and indeed we ſhall find ſome reaſons to think it was. The province of *Guoienet* again, in North Wales, extended along the ſide of that bay of ſea, which forms the mouth

mouth of the Dee, and runs up to Cheſter. Such a ſimilarity of ſituation in all theſe places, gives reaſon to ſuſpect that *Gwent*, or ſome ſuch word, was in the Britiſh tongue the name appropriated in general to a broad current or bay of water, whether freſh or ſalt, or at leaſt ſignificative of ſome circumſtance of the adjacent country, which either uſually, or elſe in theſe particular caſes at leaſt, accompanied theſe currents; ſuch as a broad valley or extent of rich flat meadows and land bordering on ſuch a bay of the ſea or broad current of any kind. The laſt is conſpicuouſly the caſe of the low meadows which border on the *Wantſua* at the Iſle of Thanet: it is the ſame at Norwich; from the deſcriptions of the other cities in queſtion in Camden and elſewhere, it appears to have been the very ſame there. The names *Vantſumu*, *Wantſua* and *Wentſar* ſeem however to be compounds; but what the import of the ſecond word is may be difficult to gueſs, or indeed which of the above three methods of reading it is the right one; the third ſeems to receive ſome confirmation from the name of a place upon the *Wantſum* at Thanet, which is ſtill called *Sarre*; and this appears to have been a name as antient as the time of the Britons; for a river of this name is found in Belgic Gaul; and the

anonymous

anonymous writer of Ravenna attributes a river called *Sarra* to Britain; and Batteley quotes a charter of King Eadbert, in which mention is made of *Sarre*, as being the uſual place of paſſage in ferry-boats to the Iſle of Thanet. I will not pretend to any conjecture at the meaning of this word; but only would ſuggeſt, whether in this caſe, as alſo in the river of the *Venta Icenorum*, *Sar* may not have ſome alluſion to a place of paſſage. On the other hand, the termination of *Vantſumu* has ſome countenance from the name *Guntum*, which Camden ſays was antiently given to *Venta Icenorum* by Britiſh authors*. As to the termination of *Wantſua*, it is poſſibly a Saxon one, from its reſemblance to that common Saxon one *ſey*: but enough ſeems to have been urged to ſhew that *Want* the firſt word of the compound has a claim to higher antiquity than Batteley has given it; and that there is no apparent foundation for his derivation of *Wantſumu* from the Saxon tongue, as if it meant *greatly decreaſing*; nay that we muſt aſcend for its meaning to more antient languages than even that of the Belgic Cymri; and therefore ſearch in the Iriſh or Scotch erſe for the origin of *Venta*, as well as of *Iſca* and *Vara*.

* The Britiſh name [of Norwich] in authors is *Caer Guntum*. *Camden*.

By

By a contrary conduct as many frivolous derivations are daily given to antient names in Britain, as Varro gave to Roman words by his ignorance of the Oriental tongues, from which the Latin had deſcended. That *Want* and *Gwent* come from the ſame Britiſh word is alſo confirmed by another place in Bede, wherein he ſays, that Reculver [Raculf] is upon the north mouth of the river *Genlade*†. Thus Batteley and all others have quoted this word; and they ſuppoſe the northermoſt part of this æſtuary at Thanet to have been called *Genlade*, and the ſouthernmoſt part *Wantſumu:* but is it not almoſt evident, that theſe two are in fact only the ſame name? Genlade being an error in the MSS. of Bede for *Gen-lande*, as it ſeems to have been ſpelt in the old deeds, from whence Stow informs us, " that the citizens of London claim the right of conſervacy of the Thames from London-bridge to *Yenland* and the Reculvers": *Yen* and *Gen* have been transformed into each other, juſt as the antient *yeven* was into *given*; and the two firſt words bear too much reſemblance to *Gwent* and *Went* for us to doubt of their have been all originally the very ſame names: more eſpe-

† Monaſterium, juxta oſtium aquilonare fluminis Genlade, Raculf nuncupatur. c. 10.

cially ſince Batteley himſelf tells us, " that in a MS. of Bede preſerved in the library of St. James's Church at St. Edmundſbury inſtead of *Genlade* is found *Ealande*; which is quite a Saxon word, but whether *Gwent* be fully ſignified by *Ea* (water or river) may be a doubt. There is room for doubt alſo whether even this name *Went* be not a compound word, or elſe whether the firſt letter performed the office only of a ſtrong aſpirate, which was therefore ſometimes dropt, when the Romans expreſſed the word by Roman letters, and at other times was denoted by different letters according to accident or the ear of different writers: For it may be obſerved, that all labial conſonants in the Scotch Erſe language ſeem to an Engliſh ear very indiſtinct and ambiguous in ſound: the reaſon of this is, becauſe the lips are ſcarce ever cloſed in pronunciation; ſo that it is very difficult to diſtinguiſh whether they pronounce a *b*, *p*, *v*, or *f*, &c; and five different perſons, in pronouncing the ſame word, will ſeem to ſound a different initial conſonant. Thus *Guen*, as Camden tells us above, means *white* in Welſh; in the Scotch-Erſe it is pronounced nearly as if written *varn*; but when expreſſed by Roman letters, they write it *Bhaan*, thinking this the neareſt expreſſion of their pronunciation; in hearing

hearing the ſame word pronounced, the ſound of an *h*, or an aſpirate before *aa* broad is perceived ſometimes very ſtrong; but the preceding labial conſonant is ſo very weak and ambiguous, that when different perſons pronounce it, ſome will appear to an Engliſh ear to ſound *b*, ſome *p*, and ſome *v* or *f*, becauſe they never cloſe their lips ſufficiently to form the conſonant diſtinctly to the ear of ſuch foreigners, as are uſed to more preciſe labial conſonants. We ought not to wonder then if *gu*, *w*, *g*, *gh*, *c* and *ch*, or a ſimple aſpirate *h* were in like manner convertible into each other when the Romans, or Latiniſed Saxons attempted to expreſs by Roman letters the word *Gwent* from the actual pronunciation of it by different Celtic tribes in Britain; hence the different forms under which it appears.

A third proof, that *Gwent* is to be referred to times prior to the Romans, if not alſo prior to the Belgic Cymri, ariſes from traces of it ſtill remaining in the neighbourhood of *Venta Belgarum* likewiſe. From the Saxon names of the diſtrict, towns and rivers adjacent to *Venta Belgarum*, ſuch as *Hant-ſhire*, South-ampton, An-dover, Teſt-an, Havant, &c. Camden juſtly ſuſpected, that they contained remains of the ſame Britiſh name, of which the Romans alſo had

had preſerved relics in their names *Clauſenton*, and Tris-anton; the former of which was the ſame as Southampton, and the latter ſome adjacent town or bay, as both Ricardus in his map, and Camden agree (*Art. Hampſhire*); poſſibly the very bay, into which the river at Chicheſter ſtill called *La-vant* as Mr. B. ſays, empties itſelf. Theſe conjectures are confirmed by Bede; who expreſsly mentions, that the Iſland of Wight (Vecta) was ſeparated from the main land by a ſea of 3 miles broad called *Solente*†. Ricardus has ſtill farther cleared up the antient name in queſtion by informing us, that the *Venta* Belgarum was ſituated near the river or bay *Antona*‡. But there is reaſon to think, that ſome initial ſound has been dropped here by the Romans; ſince by Doom's-Day book and all other evidence it appears, that the Saxons had ever preſerved an aſpirate before the word as in Hant--ſhire, &c. We may then ſuſpect that the word originally was the ſame, which the Saxons in the foregoing inſtances had changed into *Vant*, *Went*, *Yen*, *Gen*, and the Welſh to *Gwent*, &c. and which was therefore in

† Sita eſt Vecta inſula——interpoſito pelago latitudinis trium M. quod vocatur Solente. *c.* 16.

‡ Venta, nobiliſſima civitas ad flumen *Antonam* ſita. *Lib.* 1. *c.* 6. 12.

this

this caſe again either the name of the bay, or of the country adjacent to it or both. The name of the tribe alſo, which inhabited this diſtrict, again points out the original word; for it ſeems to have been the *Se-gontii*; in which the ſame name appears under the varied form of *Gont*. It is not however perfectly clear, where this tribe inhabited; but it could not have been far from *Venta Belgarum*. Cæſar mentions them, but ſays nothing of the poſition of their country. Antoninus and Ptolomey take no notice of them. Camden places them only "upon the northern edge of Hampſhire"; but this is mere conjecture, and the reaſons he gives of no force: for he ſays "the Britains and Nennius call Silcheſter in the north part of Hampſhire *Caer Segonte*" (Art. Hamſhire). But there is really no ſuch city mentioned in Nennius; nor is it known what city in this diſtrict the Britains called *Segonte*. It does not appear then but that the Segontii inhabited *all* Hantſhire down to the very ſea. Ricardus indeed ſeems to confirm Camden's conjecture (c. 6); but it is evident, that he alſo proceeds upon a miſtake; for he confines the Belgæ between the Segontii and the ſea; whereas it is evident from Ptolomey, that the Belgæ had extended themſelves as far as into Somerſetſhire, which Camden

alſo allows; for Ptolomey calls *Aquæcalidæ* (Bath) a city of the Belgæ†. The Segontii were therefore probably one tribe of the Belgæ, and inhabited the country, of which the capital was *Venta Belgarum*, and in which all thoſe other ſimilar names are found, as well as the general name of the diſtrict, corrupted into *Hant*. The river, on which Northampton is alſo ſituated, was by the Romans called *Antona*, and empties itſelf in like manner into the bay of Boſton. Mr. Barrington has obſerved moreover, that the bay of ſea, which ſeparates Beaumaris in the Iſle of Angleſey from the river Conway in Caernarvonſhire is ſtill called *La-vant*, and often corrupted into *Levan*. Now Caernarvon itſelf was the antient *Segontium* in Wales, and the river there is ſtill called *Seiont*; and the whole adjacent country formed a part of the antient Welch kingdom beforementioned, called Guinedia, Guynidh, Guoienet and Guent. M. B. has likewiſe obſerved, that the bay of ſea between Lancaſter and Cartmel is ſtill called *La-vant* and *Levan:* but whether there be any truth in his derivation of this name from *Llavam*, which he found explained in Bullet's Dictionary as meaning *to deprive*, is doubtful.

† Dobunis ſubjacent Belgæ et urbs Iſchalis, Aquæ calidæ, Venta (Ilcheſter, Bath, Wincheſter).

Remarks on the tranſlation of a paſſage in IBN YOUNES *by Mr. Coſtard, inſerted in the 67th Vol. of Philoſophical Tranſactions. Art.* 12, 1777.

MR. Coſtard has attempted to remove ſome difficulties which had occurred to Aſtronomers concerning a Lunar Eclipſe recorded in *Ibn Younes's hiſtory of celeſtial Obſervations*, by means of a more accurate tranſcript of his words from an Arabic manuſcript at Leyden. Now this and another obſervation, recorded alſo by the ſame oriental author, are ſome of the teſtimonies, which I had in view, when I ſaid at p. 211. of *Reſearches*, that I could provethe Perſian year not to have been intercalated more than 360 years before Iſdegird: and Golius in his notes on Alfraganus had long ago given a tranſcript of both theſe obſervations from *Ibn Younes*; of which however Mr. Coſtard takes no notice, although the dates in that by Golius appear different from thoſe by Schickard, Schultens, and alſo by Mr. Coſtard himſelf. It remains then to enquire, whether the tranſcript by Golius is more accurate or not than by any of theſe later copiſts, and even than that by Mr. Coſtard; becauſe it will in

ſome meaſure interfere with my concluſion from the other obſervation preſerved by *Ibn Younes*, in caſe the dates in either of them be found incoherent and inaccurate, or in caſe Golius is not to be relied upon for having given a faithful tranſcript of both: which he cannot have done, if this new tranſcript by Mr. Coſtard ſhould be preferred to that older one; unleſs there had been variations in different manuſcripts of the original, a ſuggeſtion, which ought to be better proved before it be admitted. Now if I ſhew, that the dates of the eclipſe in queſtion in the ſeveral æras are with reſpect to the cotemporary years, months and days perfectly accurate in the tranſcript of Golius, and correſpondent to the very day in the Julian Calendar, on which this eclipſe of the moon fell, namely, in the night between the 14th and 15th of May in the 979th year of Chriſt, this is ſufficient for the credit both of Golius and of *Ibn Younes* himſelf as chronologers; but whether the other circumſtances of the eclipſe as recorded in *Ibn Younes* are accurate in regard to aſtronomic articles, this is foreign to my purpoſe, and what I ſhall leave to the conſideration of aſtronomers.

Mr. Coſtard has in his diſſertation given us tranſcripts of the paſſage in *Ibn Younes* by

by Schickard, Schultens and himſelf; from which I ſhall only make the following brief extracts, taken now from memorandums made in haſte from Mr. Coſtard's diſſertation as well as from the notes of Golius, ſo that if there ſhould be any miſrepreſentation, it is to be imputed to inadvertency only.

By SCHICKARD.

Eclipſis Lunaris ann. Hegiræ 368 (8 Aug. mihi 9 Aug. 978) 14 Sywald—14 Maii, ann. Chriſt. 979.

By SCHULTENS.

Menſe Xaval ann. Hegiræ 368—25 Die Menſ. Jiar, ann. Alexandr. 1290—20 Die Buchner (ſive Pachon) 695 ann. Diocleſian —Tempus reſpondet 14 Maii 979.

By Mr. COSTARD.

Eclipſis Lunaris Menſ. Shuwald ann. Hegiræ 368—18 Menſ. Jiar, ann. Alexandr. 1290—20 Menſ. Biſhnis (Pachon) ann. Diocleſian. 698.—28 Menſis Ardipahaſcht ann. Jezdegirdis 348.

The ſame by GOLIUS in 1669.

Exemplum ex *Ibn Jounis* proponam; qui in obſervationum cæleſtium hiſtoria ſcribit

in hunc modum " Menſe Xaval anno 368 Hegiræ Luna eclipſim paſſa fuit nocte, *cujus mane* erat feria quinta: Is quidem Dies erat 25 Menſis Aredbahiſt anno Jezdegirdis 348; hoc eſt 15 Dies Jiar anno 1290 Alexandri; et Dies 20 Pachon anno 695 Diocleſiano". Debuit 20 Pachon anno illo Jezdegirdis congruere cum 20 Menſis Xahriar; ſed dicitur congruiſſe cum 25 Aredbahiſt 250 diebus poſt. *p.* 50.

Docet *Ibn Jounis*, quod Filii Mouſæ fil Xakir prodiderunt " Obſervatam fuiſſe altitudinem meridianam Solis ſub ingreſſum ejus in Capricornum, meridie feriæ quintæ diei tertiæ 5 Epagomenon poſt Aban-mah anno 337 Jezdegirdis—et rurſum primo die Chordad-mah anno 338 Jezdegirdis". *p.* 69.

The latter chiefly of theſe two obſervations recorded in Ibn Younes is that, of which I ſhall have occaſion to make uſe, whenever ſufficient leiſure ſhall offer to conſider the pretended alterations in the Perſian Calendar attributed to Jezdegird; which we ſhall find reaſon to think mere errors taken up by the moderns without any ſufficient grounds, and that no alteration whatever was at his acceſſion made in the nature of the Perſian Calendar; but only a new epoch of reckoning then began. At preſent I ſhall only obſerve in general, that neither Chriſtmannus, Scaliger, nor Petavius agree concerning

concerning the nature of these pretended innovations, and that Hyde differs from all others, making them still more considerable both in nature as well as number; it cannot then appear extraordinary if I should reject the suppositions of the last (for they are mere suppositions), just as he has rejected all those of his predecessors, and conclude that these authors have all employed themselves in ascertaining the nature of alterations, which never existed: for that the antient Persian retrograde year, and also the fixed year introduced (as I contend) not more than 360 years before Isdegird, both of which had remained in use conjointly during this period of time (the former among the learned and the religious, and the latter in vulgar civil use) both still continued also in use after the time of Jezdegird without any change whatever; and applied to the same purposes as before, the old one to regulate the rotation of their religious festivals, the new one to guide the Persians in the seasons respecting husbandry, and such other civil matters, as were connected with any particular season of the year. In order then that I may be able to draw a surer conclusion from these observations in *Ibn Younes*, I cannot but wish to see the chronologic part of this present observation in question vin-

dicated; although indeed even in the tranſcript of the latter by Mr. Coſtard the variation from that of Golius is of a kind, that cannot well impeach the credit of *Ibn Younes* ſo much as that of his tranſcriber; yet when it ſhall be ſhewn, that there is no error whatever in the dates, as tranſcribed by Golius, this will certainly communicate a ſtill greater degree of credit to the Chronology of that other obſervation found recorded in the ſame oriental author; and at the ſame time it may aſſiſt to aſcertain the right dates in ſome more obſervations quoted from him by Mr. Coſtard in his diſſertation, and remove the difficulties complained of by Aſtronomers.

The only difference between the tranſcript by Golius, and that by Mr. Coſtard, conſiſts of 3 days in the months Jiar and Adapahaſcht; for the former makes the dates in thoſe months to be the 15th and 25th; which the latter makes the 18th and 28th: the years in the ſeveral æras are the ſame in both authors, and are all accurate; for Mr. Coſtard's date 698 of Diocleſian æra muſt be a mere error of the preſs for 695; ſince in another quotation there from *Ibn Younes* Mr. Coſtard himſelf makes the year of Iſdegird 347 to be cotemporary with the Diocleſian year 694; conſequently the

year

year 348 muſt correſpond with 695, not 698. But that in the dates of the months Golius is more accurate, than Mr. Coſtard may, I think, be ſhewn without room for doubt; it being really the 15th of the Syrian month *Jiar*, and the 25th of the Perſian month Adapahaſcht, which correſponded to the 20th of the Egyptian month Pachon in the year of Chriſt 979. Of the truth of this we may *firſt* form ſome preſumption by finding 25 *of Jiar* in the tranſcript by Schultens; the error being there in the firſt figure not the ſecond. In the *ſecond* place, if according to Coſtard the 18th of one anſwered to the 28th of the other, the tranſcript by Golius muſt be at leaſt ſo far right, that the 15th of one did really correſpond to the 25th of the other: if then it can be proved, that the 15th of the Syrian month *Jiar* was coincident with the 20th of the Egyptian month Pachon, and either with the 15th of May, in courſe the 25th of the Perſian month Adapahaſcht muſt be coincident with all three. Now *thirdly*, Petavius has proved this for us: for when he treats of the Egyptian Alexandrine year (i. e. the fixed year) he ſays, "Sciendum eſt, duplicem apud Alexandrinos [lunarem] cyclum a Paulo Foroſempronienſi definiri; alterum, quem epactalem vocat,

alterum

alterum Paſchalem." *Lib.* 6. *c.* 1. Of both theſe he gives a table adjuſted to the correſpondent days of the Julian Calendar, and under that of *Pachon* in both we find the 20th of this month made coincident with the 15th of May, which was the Julian day after the eclipſe, but the ſame Arabian day to which theſe dates in *Ibn Younes* refer*. I choſe to appeal to theſe authorities in Petavius, as being an indifferent Judge; but if we reckon up the day ourſelves, we ſhall find that it muſt neceſſarily be the ſame: for the Egyptian fixed year, which was firſt eſtabliſhed after the conqueſt of Auguſtus, began with that Julian day, on which the new year's day of the year of Phillip 300 fell in the 25th year before Chriſt, and this was the 29th of Auguſt†. Now the 15th of May is the 106th day before the 29th of Auguſt: ſo alſo the 20th of Pachon is the 106th day before the end of the Egyptian year; for Pachon is the 9th month and each had 30 days with 5 additional days beſides at the end of the year. Again, the 15th of the Syrian month *Jiar* muſt alſo coincide with the

* Vide *Doctrin. Temp. Lib.* 6. *c.* 2. *p.* 524 and *c.* 4. *p.* 529 of *Edit.* 1527.

† In anno Egyptiaco fixo Thoth a Feſto *decollationis* Johannis Bapt. ſemper incipit, quam Romani Aug. 29. celebrant. *Lib.* 4. 5.

15th

15th of May; for the later Syrians embraced the Julian year in all reſpects, except that they preſerved their own names of their months, and their old commencement of the year at autumn, which in the Julian calendar they fixed on the firſt of October*. Now *Siar* is the 8th Syrian month; it is plain therefore, that both the Syrian and Egyptian date in this obſervation agree to the 15th of May: and the eclipſe happened on the 14th of May at night. In the *art de verifier les dates*, M. Pingrè has inſerted a table of all the eclipſes of any conſequence viſible in Aſia, Africa and Europe ſince Chriſt; and the Lunar Eclipſe in 979 there mentioned in May, was, "on the 14th at 4 in the afternoon, calculated for the meridian of Paris," therefore from 2 to 4

* Anni Alexandrei, poſt correctum Calendarium a Julio Cæſare, quod promulgabatur in omnibus romanæ ditionis provinciis, in Julianos tranſierunt; ita quidem ut menſes totidem diebus deſcriberentur, quot erant in Calendario Juliano: ſed nomina tamen menſium antiqua, et caput anni in autumno Græci et Aſiatici retinerent et primum diem anni a Calendis Octobris, ſive ut ipſi vocabant a *Tiſri priore* inchoarent. Arabes igitur et aſtronomi, qui longo tempore poſt correctum Calendarium vixerunt et ſcripſerunt, ita ſenſerunt, quaſi anni Alexandrei in ea formâ, quâ ſuo tempore uſurpabantur, etiam ab initio inſtituti eſſent. *Calvis. cap.* 43. *p.* 152.

hours later in Aſia*. But in the tranſcript by Golius *Ibn Younes* ſays, "Luna Eclipſim paſſa eſt *nocte, cujus mane* erat feria quinta; *is* quidem dies eſt—15 Jiar, &c." *is* muſt refer to the laſt words *cujus mane erat feria quinta*; that is, the morning *after* the eclipſe was the 15th of Jiar or 15th of May, which is right: that this muſt be his meaning is plain from the time at which the Arabians begin their day, namely, at ſunſet. According to our European practice indeed of beginning the day at midnight, the morning *before* the eclipſe would be the morning *of that ſame night* in which it happened, becauſe it happened before 12 o'clock; thus according to us it fell on the 14th day; but as the Arabians begin their day at ſun ſet, the ſame night even before 12 would fall in the 15th day of *Jiar* juſt as well as the morning *after* the eclipſe†.

Hitherto then we have diſcovered no error of any kind in the notation of this eclipſe

* 14 Mai à 4 ſoir, grandeur 8 doigts. *Chronol. des Eclipſes. Ann.* 979. *p.* 71. *Edit.* 1770.

† Apud Arabes primus dies dominicus incipit a tempore occaſus ſolis die ſabbati, et finitur tempore occaſus in die dominica et ſimiliter de aliis: poſuerunt enim Arabes initium cujuslibet diei *cum nocte ſua* ab hora occaſus ſolis: apud Græcos vero et cæteras gentes dies præcedit noctem. *Brevis Compilatio Alfragani aliorumque, p.* 2. *prefixed to Albutegnius.* 1537.

in

in *Ibn Younes* ſo far as reſpects the chronologic part of it; it only remains to enquire whether the 25th of the 2d Perſian month *Adapabaſcht* would not alſo be coincident with the 15th of May in that ſame year 979. Mr. Coſtard has in fact confeſſed, that it would, by making the 28th coincident with the 18th of *Jiar*, which was coincident with the 18th of May: but it may be more ſatisfactory to aſſure ourſelves of the fact by our own concluſions. Now the 1ſt Chaldæan or Egyptian year began at noon on the 26th of February according to the computations by this year in Ptolomey's Aſtronomy: but both Scaliger and all others agree, that in the æra of Iſdegird the firſt day of the 1ſt Perſian month *Pharvardin* began on the 16th of June in the year of Chriſt 632; and alſo that this firſt month coincided altogether with the 4th Egyptian month *Choiac*: it began therefore at noon in that year*. Chriſtmannus and Petavius

* [Ann. 632] eadem neomenia *Di* perſici et *Thoth* Egyptiaci fuit: *Thoth* enim in 1380 Nabonaſſari cæpit 18 martii. *Scalig. lib. 3, de anno Jezdegird.* Now *Di* was the 10th Perſian month, from which incluſively to the end of the year were 90 days, that is, 3 Perſian or Egyptian months of 30 days each: if *Di* then began on the 18th of March in 1380 (which *began* in 632d of Chriſt) from hence incluſively to the 15th of June inculſively are alſo 90 days: thus the

ſay the ſame*. Now as the year of Jezdegird was retrograde, in 348 full years its new year would have gone back from the 16th of June one fourth of that ſum in days, which is exactly 87 days; but as 632 was a leap year, and as the intercalary day had been already inſerted in February, before the 1ſt of Iſdegird began, which was not until the 16th of June as it was fixed after that intercalation; therefore no removal back of the new year of Iſdegird would be effected after 632, nor until the new year of Iſdegird which was next *ſubſequent* to the following leap year; which following leap year having its intercalary day not inſerted until near the end of the 4th year of Iſdegird, namely in February 636, conſequently the 5th year of Iſdegird which commenced in June 636 is the firſt, which would be affected by the leap year, and then the *firſt* removal of it would be made from the 16th to the 15th of June; for the removal of it muſt have been always made in that year

firſt Perſian month *Phavardin* of the 1ſt year of Jezdegird muſt begin on the 16th of June, and be coincident with the 4th Egyptian month *Choiac*.

* Jezdegirdis æra ab anno 632 incipit Junii 16, quo die cæpit Neomenia *Phravardin* unâ cum Neomenia *Choiac* anni Nabonaſſarei 1380. Ita Chriſtmannus. *Doctr. Temp. lib.* 3. *cap.* 16

of

of Iſdegird, which *began* next *after* every Julian leap year*: becauſe it is the inſertion of the intercalary day on the leap year, which protrudes forward all the ſubſequent Julian days 1 day later than before, and thus makes the Perſian days, before cotemporary, begin one day ſooner afterwards in each Julian month. Since then there are exactly 4 times 87 in 348, and ſince the firſt 4 years of this ſum were compleatly expired and the 5th begun, before the Perſian new year had moved back 1 day out of theſe 87, conſequently in like manner the 348th muſt be compleatly expired and the 349th begun before it would have moved back the 87th day: ſo that the 348th year commenced ſtill upon the 86th day before the 16th of June, and this 86th day was the 22d of March†. Now *Adapahaſcht* was the 2d month in the Perſian Calendar: and if the 1ſt month *Phavardin* commenced on the

* Quilibet annus [Egyptiacus] *proxime poſt* biſextum [Julianum] *iniens* uno die epocham anni ſuperioris anticipat in Juliano Calendario; *ante* biſextum vero ab eodem die incipit: diviſis annis Nabonaſſari per quadrennia poſt annum 227, quartus annus quadrennii in biſextilem annum Julianum incurret. *lib.* 7. 13. It would be the ſame in the æra of Iſdegird.

† For 10 days at the end of March, 30 in April, 31 in May and 15 in June amount to 86,

22d

22d of March in the year of Iſdegird 348, the 2d month *Adapahaſcht* would commence on the 30th day after, which was the 21ſt of April; from which day inclusively, if we reckon forward 25 days more, the 10 firſt would fall at the end of April, and the 15 following days at the beginning of May; thus it is plain, that the 25th day would be coincident with the 15th of May in that year of Iſdegird 348, the 979th after Chriſt.

Since then all the dates in the ſeveral months, years and æras, as tranſcribed from *Ibn Younes* by Golius coincide accurately together, and with the Julian day *after* the eclipſe, as calculated by M. Pingrè; it follows, that if the other circumſtances concerning the eclipſe, as deſcribed by *Ibn Younes* and tranſlated by others, do not agree to the *night preceding* the 15th of May, the error muſt be in them, not in any of the dates; and be an error either in *Ibn Younes's* relation, or made by his copiſts; which is a matter of ſtill farther enquiry: but even it if ſhould be found to be in *Ibn Younes* himſelf, yet it can only impeach his accuracy in recording aſtronomic obſervations, not his chronologic accuracy. Therefore I may ſtill with the utmoſt confidence draw the neceſſary conſequence, which will follow from

from that other obſervation found recorded ſomewhere in his works by Golius, and tranſcribed thence into the notes of the latter on Alfraganus ſo long ago as in 1669*. If any perſon ſhould have opportunity of meeting with that paſſage in the original of *Ibn Younes*, I ſhould be glad of a new tranſlation of the ſame, if ſent to the publiſher for the author's uſe; or any other remarks communicated concerning errors of my

* There is the greater reaſon to depend on this tranſcript by Golius, becauſe it is plain, that it has not been altered or manufactured by Golius himſelf in order to make it accord with any miſtaken opinions of his own concerning the days in the ſeveral years, and months, which were coincident with each other: for he himſelf complains of an error here in *Ibn Younes* in his not making "the 20th of Pachon coincide with the 20th of Xahriar, but with the 25th of *Adapahaſcht* 250 days *after*." There were indeed 250 days from the 20th of the 6th Perſian month *Xahriar* (Shahriar) on reckoning forward to the 25th of *Adapahaſcht* in the *next* year; but how could the 2d be called *after* the 6th in the *ſame year* (anno illo)? or which did he conſider as being the 1ſt month? for if he made *Aban* or *Adur* (the 8th and 9th) to be the 1ſt Perſian month, ſtill Adapahaſcht the 2d would always precede Xahriar the 6th in the Calendar of Iſdegird; as it would alſo precede it in the ſame Julian year; for the former fell in May, therefore the latter in September. He muſt then have thought, that there was an error in the year aswell as month.

own

own ſhall be carefully attended to, and the errors corrected if found to be real ones.

If it ſhould be ſtill urged, that the 25th of Adapahaſcht by not beginning until noon on the 15th of May, does not include the *foregoing* morning of that Julian day; it ſhould be alſo conſidered, that noon is only the aſtronomic commencement of a Chaldæan and Perſian day by Ptolomey and his followers among the antients and moderns, adopted for convenience on account of noon being a fixed point; whereas the popular and vulgar commencement of a day at Babylon, as well as in Egypt and among the Greeks and Romans, was at ſun riſe; which falling earlier or later on different days in ſummer and winter, made aſtronomic computations leſs accurate and more troubleſome. Accordingly Dodwell has ſhewn, that the aſtronomers alſo before Ptolomey had adopted the popular method; Ptolomey therefore often reduces obſervations regiſtered in that method to his own*. Hence

* Duplicem diei Ægyptiaci initium conſtituit Ptolomæus, civile aliud, aliud aſtronomicum; civile deducit a ſolis ortu, idque ſatis congrue pro more Babyloniorum, a quibus anni formam ad Ægyptios emanaſſe dixeram: idem enim civilis diei initium fuiſſe etiam apud Babylonios multos veterum teſtes habemus, Plinium (2. 77) Gellium (3. 2) Cenſorinum (c. 23.) Macro-

it follows, that all Chaldæan days mentioned in Ptolomey as commencing at noon, were according to the vulgar method at Babylon actually accounted to begin at ſun riſe; the Perſians doubtleſs followed the ſame method, as *Ibn Younes* here alſo has done after them; ſo that the 25th of Adapahaſcht as fixed above to commence at noon on the 15th of May, in conformity to the Chaldæan year in Ptolomey, would by the Perſians be extended back ſo as to include the *preceding* morning, which accordingly is actually done here by *Ibn Younes**.

Finally, the extract from Schickard adds, " that this eclipſe happened on the 14th of

Macrobium (Satur. 1. 3.)—Cæterum Ægiptios ab illo, quod dixi, initio dies ſuos cenſuiſſe, è verbis Ptolomæi colligimus diſertiſſimis—inde occaſio cur *toties* horas καιρικας in ισημερινας convertat Ptolomæus, quod ſcilicet a *mutabili* initio illi procederent Aſtronomorum calculi; ea autem nulla prorſus fuiſſet ſi a meridie aut a media nocte illi proceſſiſſent calculi—inde etiam *neceſſitas* aliud conſtituendi et *immobile* diei exordium; hoc a meridie arceſſit Ptolomæus—dies tamen *idem* eſt, tam Julianus quam Atticus, qui *priori* Ægiptii diei parti reſpondet, ab utrovis initio cenſeatur. *De vet. Cyclis. Diſſ.* 2. 7.

* Petavius obſerves, that a ſimilar practice obtains in the computations of the Jews according to their modern calendar, Dies illorum ab initio noctis incipit; et nihilominus Neomeniarum epilogiſmi a meridie [vide l. ſequente] aſtronomico more, procedunt, *Doctr. Temp. lib.* 7, 17.

the Arabian month Sywald [Shuwald];" now this is a circumſtance not inſerted in any of the other tranſcripts, for although they agree to the Arabian month, yet they do not mention the particular day: it may be doubted then, whether Schickard found this in the original Arabic, or whether it be not an addition of his own: but whichever be the fact, yet this date likewiſe is right. For the 368th year of the Hegira began, as Schickard rightly obſerves in the extract, on the 9th of Auguſt in the year of Chriſt 978*: from this ninth of Auguſt incluſively to the eclipſe on the following 14th of May in 979, are 279 Julian days: but as the firſt Arabian day of 368 began at ſun ſet before the 9th of Auguſt (ſee note p. 32.) therefore the 279th Arabian day would be fully expired at ſun ſet on the 14th of May before the eclipſe; which conſequently would fall in the following day, and the 280th Julian day. Accordingly the 14th of their 10th month *Sywald* is the 280th Arabian day from the beginning of their firſt month *Muharram:*

* The Benedictine author of *Art de verifier les Dates*, in his Chronologic Table of cotemporary years in different æras, places with Schickard the commencement of the 368th y. of Hegira on Auguſt 9 in 978. *p.* 20.

for

for the Arabian year consists of months alternately of 30 and 29 days, beginning with one of 30; therefore the first 9 months would contain 5 months of 30 days (150) and 4 of 29 (116); to which adding the 14 of the 10th month they amount to 280: the 14th of Sywald must therefore be cotemporary with 15th of May, O. S. in the year 979; there is no error of date then in the transcript by Schickard. In that by Scultens however we find the 25th of *Jiar* instead of the 15th: but this mistake can scarcely be attributed with probability to Schultens himself, but must be either an error of the press or in some copy made from his words: for Schultens could not but know, that the Syrian months corresponded throughout the year to the Julian ones, month for month and day for day. Thus it appears, that every one of these learned foreigners agree with each other and with the truth, and the only errors are in this transcript by Mr. Costard, which undertakes to correct all the others. Can we suppose all these to be mere errors of the press, and that this learned work the *Philosophical Transactions*, which circulates over all Europe, is so negligently compiled, as to make 4 or 5 capital errors within a few lines and by this inattention create new difficulties at

the very moment, that the author is attempting to remove the ill effects of many ſuppoſed former inſtances of inattention in others? yet even if this ſhould be really the caſe, it was ſtill equally neceſſary to aſcertain this fact to readers, that they may know who is right, and who wrong, and how far; whereby we ſhall be better able to form a proper judgment concerning that other obſervation quoted by Golius from *Ibn Younes*, in which it may not be ſo eaſy to remove all difficulty, and where we are more perplexed by the accurate dates in this preſent obſervation. But, that it is poſſible for Mr. Coſtard himſelf not to have been ſufficiently attentive in his tranſcript, we may reaſonably conceive by ſimilar inſtances, which I have before pointed out in his quotation of paſſages from Cenſorinus and Ptolomey. I may alſo now add another inſtance in his *hiſtory of Aſtronomy* concerning a paſſage of Theon, Mr. Coſtard ſays, "in the year after Chriſt 365 Theon obſerved at Alexandria an eclipſe of the Sun," *p.* 157. But this could not be in 365; for in that year there was no eclipſe of the ſun, at leaſt not of conſequence, viſible at Alexandria, in caſe we may believe Mr. Pingrè; who in his liſt of eclipſes ſince Chriſt, takes notice of only one in 365, and this ſcarcely viſible even on the North of Aſia.

Asia*. The eclipse then meant by Mr. Costard seems to be a total one referred to by Theon "in the 1112th Chaldæan year, and on the 24th of the first Egyptian month Thoth, the 81st Diocletian year†." This 1112th year *began* on the 24th of May *in* 364; the 24th of Thoth therefore coincided with 16th of June, O. S. in that Julian year; accordingly on that day and hour in that year 364, M. Pingrè has registered the eclipse in question‡; which again helps to confirm the *accuracy* of the Chaldæan æra, and of that year before Christ 480, which Chronologers have made conumerary with our foundation date 268 in the Chaldæan æra. It is always with reluctance that I take notice of any mistakes by others, nor except when it is necessary in order to ascertain the truth and to remove doubts and the foundation of objections, which have been or may be otherwise urged against

* Juin 6 a 1 & ½ matin tres petite au Nord de l'Asie. *Chron. des Eclipſ. p.* 58.

† Ινα την διακρισιν των ηλιακων εκλειψεων εχομεν—προεκτεθειμενης ημιν ακριβους εκλειπτικης συζυγιας γεγενημενης και Αιγυπτιους τω αριθ ἑτει απο Ναβοναssαρχ εν τη κδ τ Θωθ—τον δε τ μεσου της εκλειψεως χρονον μετα β ωρας ισημερινας. *Comment. in Ptolom. lib.* 6.—Τω πα Διοκλητιανο ἑτει συναγεται απο Ναβοναssαρχ ἑτη αριθ. *Ibid.*

‡ An. Christ. 364. 16 Juin à 1 soir, Europe, Afrique, Asie à l'Oueſt, centrale, & totale. *Ibid.*

those

thoſe principles, which ſerve to correct any current Chronologic errors. The preſent example moreover furniſhes us with another inſtance of the propriety of diſtinguiſhing accurately between the *conumerary* and *cotemporary* years in different æras; for although 364 was the Julian year before Chriſt cotemporary with this eclipſe; yet 365 was the year, which was conumerary with the Chaldæan year 1112, in which this eclipſe happened; and this was the probable cauſe of Mr. Coſtard's miſtake, as it has often alſo been to many other writers.

The preceding inveſtigations alſo, beſides vindicating the credit of *Ibn Younes* and Golius, ſupply us with a ſtill farther confirmation of the *accuracy* of the Chaldæan æra, and that our foundation dates in it 227 and 268 have been rightly made conumerary with the 521ſt and 480th before Chriſt; otherwiſe neither could the 1379th be *conumerary* with the 632d of Chriſt, nor the 1380th be *cotemporary* with it after March 17; and if the 1ſt year of Iſdegird did not commence both in the 1380th of the one æra and in the 632d of the other, neither could the 348th of Iſdegird be *cotemporary* with part of 979th of Chriſt; and unleſs alſo the 1ſt Chaldæan year began on the 26th of February, the 4th Chaldæan and Egyptian month could not

not in 1380 have exactly coincided with the 1ſt Perſian month commencing on the 16th of June; and unleſs it commenced on that day the 348th of Iſdegird could not have commenced on the 22d of March, and without this, the 25th of Adapahaſcht could not have fallen in that year on the 15th of May, correſpondent to the Perſian day on which *Ibn Younes* has regiſtered the eclipſe; and on the Julian night before which day M. Pingrè has calculated, that it muſt have neceſſarily happened, without having probably had the leaſt knowledge, that any oriental aſtronomers in Arabia had really obſerved and regiſtered it on the very night which M. Pingrè points out. This eclipſe, theſe calculations, and the correſpondent dates verify therefore the *accuracy* of all the foregoing articles: but if any one ſhould ſtill ſuppoſe, that it might be by a mere accident that the 1ſt year and month of Iſdegird was made by the Perſians to commence on the ſame day with the 4th Egyptian month, yet it will appear plainly to have happened as a neceſſary conſequence of theſe two prior facts, that originally the Perſian year commenced on the ſame Julian day in a retrograde courſe as the Egyptian year; and that a fixed year was firſt brought into Perſia in 272, when the Egyptian new year fell on the 16th of June;

which day remaining ever after the firſt of the Perſian fixed year, the Egyptian new year would after 360 years have neceſſarily gone back exactly 3 months from this fixed new year on June 16. Whereby we ſhall be able to conceive in what manner the Perſians, in adopting an intercalated year in 272d of Chriſt, ſo connected it with their antient retrograde year, as that their religious feſtivals ſhould ſtill, as before, revolve by rotation through every ſeaſon of the year (which was what they deſired) and yet at the ſame time the commencement of their popular year remain ever after fixed to the 16th of June; when in 272 they firſt, in imitation of the Julian year then current in the Roman provinces of Aſia, introduced in like manner a year fixed by intercalation for greater convenience in all civil and rural buſineſs: thus they celebrated like the year of Jubilee among the Jews and many other oriental nations the 50th year incluſively after the firſt riſe of their 2d monarchy in 223, by commencing a new calendar and probably a new æra alſo from that memorable year 272; which was alſo the 1ſt year of their new king *Varanes* the 1ſt; and a period of 360 years (a magnus annus equal to the number of days in their calendar) before the æra of Iſdegird.

Remarks

Remarks on Mr. RICHARDSON'S DISSERTATION ON THE LITERATURE OF EASTERN NATIONS, *ſo far as reſpects his propoſed method of correcting prophane and ſacred hiſtory and chronology by means of traditionary accounts found in authors of modern Perſia.*

IN this diſſertation M. R. endeavours to recommend the ſtudy of the Perſian and other oriental languages and literature, by ſhewing that they may prove uſeful toward illuſtrating the chronology, hiſtory, mythology, languages and manners of antient prophane nations, and even of the ſacred hiſtory of the Jews. With reſpect to the laſt article he makes many obſervations; which interfere with both the object and arguments in my *Reſearches*: they ſeem however of too looſe and incoherent a texture to induce the public to prefer the traditionary and poetic tales of modern Perſian authors to the hiſtories of the Greeks, who were parties as well as cotemporaries to moſt of the events in queſtion. *Firdouſi* is the oldeſt of theſe Perſian writers, and he lived 1500 years after Cyrus, and 350 years after the deſtruction of the ſecond Perſian monarchy: Mr. R.'s own account of him ſufficiently ſhews

what little accuracy either in hiſtory or Chronology is to be expected from this author, "This epic poet, in his romantic hiſtory of the Perſian kings and heroes, diſplays an imagination hardly inferior to Homer: the whole fanciful range of Perſian enchantment he has interwoven in his poems, which abound with the nobleſt efforts of genius; he has ſtamped a dignity on the monſters and fabling of the Eaſt, equal to that, which the prince of epic poetry has given to the mythology of antient Greece." P. 23. His account of the ſources, whence *Firdouſi* drew the materials for this work is of a piece with the work itſelf, "The conqueſt of Perſia by the Arabians proved a radical ſubverſion of every characteriſtic circumſtance, which diſtinguiſhes nation from nation—their antient government overturned, their religion proſcribed, their laws trampled on, their books burnt, and all who profeſſed their religion perſecuted with the moſt unrelenting rigour (p. 19.) "The number of manuſcripts ſuppoſed to have been burnt exceeded 500,000; they were diſtributed as fuel to the keepers of public baths; ſome however are ſuppoſed to have been privately ſaved": of theſe Mr. R. has been able to mention only three, the two firſt of which have never yet been ſeen by any European; but

but only one of them ſaid to have been modernized in the 11th century, and ſome paſſages of the third *(Erdaviraf Nama)* extracted by Dr. Hyde, are, as Mr. R. contends, writ in the preſent dialect of Perſia " and are ſimply the *modern* language in antient characters" (note to p. 17). Whence one may very naturally conclude, that it is either an impoſition upon the public, or at beſt has been modernized like the other; and not, as Mr. R. concludes, that there was little difference between the antient Perſian language and that now prevailing in Perſia. In like manner it has been often ſaid, that when the vaſt libraries at Alexandria and Conſtantinople were burnt by the Mahometans, ſome manuſcripts were preſerved and ſuppoſed to be ſtill exiſting in the Grand Seignior's ſeraglio; nevertheleſs time and enquiry have never yet been able to diſcover a ſingle one: Mahometan zeal appears to have done its work in both caſes moſt effectually. Mr. R. adds however, " That all Perſian books were not deſtroyed by the Arabians, is certain: ſome, which concerned not the religion of the Magi, fell into the hands of thoſe, who admired and preſerved them." p. 53. But why ſhould he ſuppoſe Mahometan zeal more favourable to the hiſtory and ſcience of Per-

ſia, than it was to thoſe of Greece? He goes on, "In the preface to a copy of *Firdouſi*'s poem we are informed, that a book of hiſtory was diſcovered during the general havoc by *Saad* one of the Mahometan generals, and carefully preſerved by him as containing nothing repugnant to the tenets of the Alcoran." Yet it does not appear by theſe words, that Firdouſi himſelf wrote this preface; if this be only a compoſition by ſome later unknown hand, the information is entitled to little credit, and ſeems only a ſtudied apology for the apparent ignorance of the Perſians concerning the ſources whence Firdouſi drew his materials. As to what is ſubjoined, "That as M. d'Herbelot obſerves, it was from *a collection* of antient Perſian hiſtorians in the older dialect, that Firdouſi drew materials for his immortal work": this is at beſt contradictory to what precedes; but it were to be wiſhed, that M. R. had quoted the very words of d'Herbelot; the more ſo, becauſe we ſhall find, that he has been repeatedly inattentive to the meaning and words both of Joſephus and the Jewiſh ſcriptures. Excepting the abovementioned ſources of information to Firdouſi Mr. R. points out no other beſides *tradition*; concerning which he obſerves, "That many events *may have* been

been in this manner preſerved in poems and legendary tales, like the runic fragments of the North, the romanzes of Spain or the heroic ballads of our own country, ſeems to be highly probable, as well as that *ſuch materials* may have originally ſuggeſted to Firdouſi many of the adventures in his poem; which, like Homer, when ſtript of the machinery of ſupernatural beings, is ſuppoſed to contain much true hiſtory, and a moſt undoubted picture of the ſuperſtition and manners of the times." p. 57; he might have added alſo, a moſt undoubted picture of the *ignorance* even of thoſe times in which *Firdouſi* lived concerning antient events in Perſia. Such then being, ſo far as has hitherto come to our knowledge, the moſt authentic documents and ſources of information to *Firdouſi*, and ſuch being the uſe, which this poet made of what few traditions he had been able to collect, nothing more authentic can be expected from his hiſtoric ſucceſſors in Perſia, than from their great archetype; and the propoſal, of comparing ſuch accounts with the annals of the cotemporary Greeks, is a ſcheme of a like nature with that of Mr. Wood concerning Homer, and the tranſlator of Oſſian, in ſetting up theſe epic poets for teachers of hiſtory. All ſuch attempts ſeem to take

their

their riſe from that eternal deſire of novelty in men; who, when they are run almoſt to the end of their line, and can find little new under the ſun, will rather venture at the ſubverſion of thoſe buildings, which erudition had with pains erected before, than not produce ſomething new; as if the firſt ſtep to real knowledge was to unlearn all, which had been learnt already. Nevertheleſs the Greeks may have often miſtaken a name, a date or a fact, and in general have been leſs attentive to the hiſtory of barbarous nations, than became ſuch an intelligent and civilized people. I ſhall not therefore enter into any diſplay of the incongruities in thoſe tales and liſts of kings and heroes, which Mr. R. dignifies with the name of Perſian hiſtory, and in which after all we can only end as well as begin in Romance: but I ſhall confine my enquiries to ſuch articles, as admit of our arriving to ſomething like truth at laſt; that is, to point out what repeated errors of fact Mr. R. has fallen into concerning Joſephus, the ſcriptures, modern commentators and other writers; for a diſplay of a few of theſe will tend to throw additional light upon various parts of our *reſearches* concerning chronology, while at the ſame time they exhibit a ſufficient ſpecimen of the errors on which this

this new ſyſtem of prophane and ſcriptural chronology is propoſed to be built.

When M. R. undertakes to ſhew what advantages may be derived from the hiſtories of modern Perſia toward illuſtrating the prophane chronology of the antients, together with that of the Jewiſh ſcriptures he makes the following remarks: "The endeavours of commentators to reconcile all the events of antient times to the hiſtory of the Greeks, have by no means been confined to Pagan annals. The Chronology of the ſacred writings has in many points, without the appearance of neceſſity, been forced into an analogy with their imaginary æras: in conſequence of which a variety of anachroniſms have been introduced, which are in direct oppoſition to the *hiſtorical books of Scripture*, to the *Jewiſh Chronicles*, to *Joſephus* and to all obſervation *on the longevity of Man*. I ſhall attempt to clear up one event ſubmiting with much deference the ſolidity of my conjectures to men of deeper reſearch and ſuperior abilities. The Grecians have given us the hiſtory of a Perſian king called Κυρος, which we tranſlate *Cyrus*. Iſaiah propheſies, that a Prince *Coreſh* will releaſe the Jews from captivity, and order the rebuilding of the Temple.

To reconcile theſe two Princes has been conſidered as an object of high importance; and much learning has been employed to embarraſs a much more ſimple and ſatisfactory chronology. The Jewiſh larger Chronicle *and Joſephus* finiſh the *building of the temple* only about 34 years before the fall of the Perſian Empire: the Samaritan interruptions had protracted the completion of the work near 20 years: the Macedonian conqueſt took place about the year 331; to which, if we add the 54 years abovementioned, the proclamation of *Coreſh* muſt have been iſſued about the year 385. But the *death of Cyrus* is placed by the concurrence of our Chronologers in 529, or 144 years before this period: he therefore could not be the prince alluded to by Iſaiah. As a confirmation of the probability of the Jewiſh dates Joſephus mentions expreſsly, that Sanballat the Samaritan governor, who had given ſo much interruption to the building the temple *was alive in the time of Alexander*, which is extremely poſſible by the above chronology; but by the common ſyſtem he muſt have then *exceeded* 200 years of age. Jaddua was the high prieſt who met Alexander on his return from the ſiege of Tyre in the year 332. Now by the ſacred

cred writings we find, that Jaddua was the fifth in ſucceſſion from Jeſhua, who together with Zorobabel conducted home the captive Jews. This event, if connected with the Grecian Cyrus muſt have been in the year 536, or 204 years before the abovementioned meeting; which happened in the *7th* year of Jaddua's prieſthood. As Jeſhua was probably advanced in age, when commiſſioned with Zorobabel to lead the captive people home, *ſeventeen* years may be a full allowance for his dignity ſubſequent to that period; which leaves *forty-five* years each to the other four, a term far beyond all calculation and probability—But for no reaſon that can apparently be diſcovered, excepting to force the *Coreſh* of Iſaiah to be the Greek Cyrus, have our commentators laboured to involve a plainer narrative in darkneſs; and to create with many a doubt of the whole, becauſe there appeared irreconcileable contradictions in the parts. As an attachment to the chronology of Greece ſeems to have led therefore to many unneceſſary liberties with ſcripture, it cannot be improper to obſerve, how far the hiſtorians of Perſia correſpond with the ſacred writings; and we ſhall obſerve a remarkable concurrence between the Jewiſh dates and

the chronology of the Perſians." *Diſſert. on the Languages and Literature of Eaſtern Nations. 1ſt Edit. p. 74. by J. Richardſon, Eſq. Fell. Society of Antiquaries*, 1777.

Now that the expoſitions of ſcripture by commentators do materially diſagree in point of hiſtory as well as chronology with the traditions contained in the *Jewiſh Chronicles Seder Olam*, and others, is true: but what are theſe chronicles? Modern works compiled many hundreds of years later than Joſephus and the Chriſtian æra. If then this learned Jew, living in the moſt intelligent age of the world, while all antient manuſcripts were ſtill extant, while his own nation was ſtill exiſting, the temple and archives of the ſtate ſtill preſerved, was able to collect among his countrymen ſo little information concerning the antiquities of his own nation, except what was in the moſt abſurd contradiction to the beſt prophane memorials, and even in repeated contradiction to himſelf, as in ſome caſes I have already ſhewn, and ſhall have frequent occaſion to ſhew hereafter; what accuracy can be expected from the ſame ſource of Jewiſh traditions in much later times, when the Jewiſh ſtate was diſſolved, its inhabitants proſcribed and ſcattered over the world? Nay

it

it appears evident from a compariſon of Joſephus with the ſacred ſcriptures of the Jews and with prophane hiſtory, that he could have no memorials and authentic traditions to work upon, except what he derived from one or other of theſe two ſources ſcripture or prophane authors: for he never deviates from ſcripture without departing alſo from prophane hiſtory, and then he falls into the ſtrangeſt contradictions and extravagancies. Moreover from the time where the ſacred books of the Jews end, which is with Nehemiah and the reign of Darius 2d, called the Perſian (Nehem. xii. 22.) until the commencement of the book of Macchabees, after the death of Seleucus, there is a total void in the ſacred ſcriptures concerning the hiſtory of the Jews: in like manner there is almoſt a total void in Joſephus; there being only one or two anecdotes collected by him from civil traditions concerning the tranſactions of the Jews during that long ſpace of 100 years, and even theſe there is great reaſon to ſuſpect of error and miſrepreſentation. It is even doubtful, whether the Jews had preſerved any more accurate liſt of the ſucceſſion of their high prieſts, than the liſt of thoſe, who were incidentally mentioned in their ſcriptures;

and

and which was never intended for a complete one; ſo that their ſacred books contained their only body of authentic civil hiſtory as well as religion. I ſhall uſe no other argument than this apparent hiſtoric ignorance of Joſephus concerning the Jews in the times, which preceded and followed *the fall of the Perſian empire*, to diſcredit the pretended better information, which Mr. R. ſuppoſes to be contained in theſe ſtill more modern compilations, the *Jewiſh Chronicles*, eſpecially as they have been already for other reaſons ſufficiently exploded by others.

* An ſatius eſt non tantum *gentium eruditorum annales* pervertere, ſed etiam ſcripturæ fidem & harmoniam deſtruere ut placeamus Rabbinis? Nimis creduli ſumus ſi Chronologiam ſacræ hiſtoriæ ab illis Judæorum *Chronicis* accipere velimus: nihil tam monſtroſus eſt, quod illorum *Chronica* non contineant, Samuelem tredecim tantum aiunt annos regnaſſe, Platonem in Ægypto converſatum fuiſſe cum Jeremia, Regnum Perſarum *a Cyro* ad mortem Alexandri non diutius 52 ſtetiſſe annis, multaque alia magis etiam num monſtroſa; & tamen cæci iſti Chriſtianos occulatos qua volunt ducunt. *Voſſii ſacr. Chronol. ad Lectorem.* Here we may obſerve, that if Voſſius has given an accurate account, thoſe Chronicles make it only 52 years from *Cyrus* (and not merely from the building of the temple) to Alexander: they therefore themſelves explain the *Coreſh* of Iſaiah to mean the Greek Cyrus, and Mr. R. cannot have given us a faithful account of their contents. However that other Jewiſh Chronicle called *Joſippon* certainly acknowledges *Cyrus*

I allow alſo, that the modern *Hiſtorians of Aſia* may perhaps have a remarkable concurrence with the accounts in the *Jewiſh Chronicles*; but ſuch agreement is no proof of the authenticity of either, and only that one erroneous account may have been copied from another: for the modern Perſians, thro' want of better information and more authentic memorials concerning their own antiquities, have probably taken up with thoſe traditions concerning themſelves, which they found current among the Jews, who dwelt in that country: which with ſome poetic variations Ferdouſi and other hiſtoric poets have adapted to their own hiſtories; and by attributing to more antient kings events belonging to later ones, alſo by attributing to the ſame perſon actions of different kings of the ſame name, they have made up that romantic medley of truth and falſehood called Perſian hiſtory; in which we find a tale concerning Pythagoras ſimilar to that of Plato in the Jewiſh Chronicles, except that the Perſians have outdone them in regard to the antiquity attributed to their

rus the father of Cambyſes to be the Deliverer of the Jews from captivity; and this work the Jewiſh Rabbins *extollunt ad ſydera quaſi veracem & pene divinum* (præf. Gagnieri) and ſ *p.* 29.

favorite

favorite Greek Philoſopher; but that Pythagoras and a Jew *Iſſouf* ſhould be made to be prime miniſters to Gjemſhid ſufficiently indicates from what late ſources the Perſian hiſtorians borrowed their relations*. M. R. prudently has omitted to fix the age in which Gjemſchid lived; for Herbelot informs us, that the Perſians aſcribe to him a reign of 700 years; yet Mr. R. has imprudently attempted to aſcertain the age of

* Les recits des ecrivains Perſans, d'ailleurs trop recens pour meriter une grande confiance ſur les antiquites de leur nation, ne ſont qu'un amas de fables baties ſur des faits defigurées, ſur des traditions melées & confondues & quelque fois ſur des allegories bizarres & outrées; il m'a paru en general qu'ils attribuoient à leurs rois *Piſchdadiens* la plus part des choſes, qu'ils vouloient faire paſſer pour fort anciennes, ſoit qu'elles le fuſſent réellement ou non: ce qu'ils diſent par exemple du Juif *Iſſouf* & *Pythagore* miniſtres de Gjemſchid reduiroit la pretendue antiquité de Gjemſchid au temps du Cyrus & ſes ſucceſſeurs. *Obſerv. ſur l'annee des Perſes par M. Gibert, dans les Mem. de l'Academ. tom.* 31. Perſæ hodie frequenter in ore habent *Braham* (Abraham) & *Mûſa* (Moſes) & *Juſuph* (Joſeph) aliaque Vet. Teſt. nomina—adeo ut non ſit mirum ſi omnes Judæorum conſuetudines innotuerint Perſis, qui multas ex iis ſibi retinuerunt; unde magna eſt in utriuſque gentis religione convenientia. *Hyde c.* 11. *p.* 177. This agreement however is more probably owing to the introduction of Mahometiſm, which is a ſect of Judaiſm, than as Hyde ſuppoſes to more antient connexions.

Gjemſchid's

Gjemſchid's immediate ſucceſſor *Zohac* or *Dahac*, the tyrant already mentioned, whom he places about 800 years before Chriſt; with what little certainty the hyperbolic length of Gjemſchid's reign ſufficiently proves*. This antiquity of 250 years too much, according to Mr. R's computation, appears therefore no obſtacle to *Dahac's* being really the ſame as *Smerdis*; eſpecially ſince Herbelot acknowledges alſo, that for *Afraſiab* a Scythian king of that age to have performed all the atchievements aſcribed to him, he muſt have lived not leſs than 3 or 400 years†. What excellent aſſiſtance muſt ſuch a chronology afford to the connection of ſacred and prophane hiſtory! Neither

* P. 132.—Zohac, comme diſent les Romans, tyran fameux—n'eſt ſelon moi, qu'un perſonage allegorique, qui repreſente quelque ennemi, dont les Perſans croient avoir beaucoup de ſe plaindre. *Gibert D°* p. 72. Some Perſian authors call him an Arabian; but Hyde explains the name as a corruption of *Houchd, Jebud*, a *Jew*. This Perſian word ſeems to be the ſame as *Hodaviah* in Ezra ii. 40. who in iii. 9. is expreſsly called Judah. Accordingly we are informed by Herodotus, that Smerdis was at leaſt a foreigner and a Mede, the greateſt object of indignation therefore in that age to the Perſians their conquerors; and as ſo many Jews had been carried into captivity to Media by Salmanaſſar, he might poſſibly be of Jewiſh extraction.

† Preſque tous les Hiſtoriens de Perſe donnent ſept cent ans de regne a Giamſchid. Khondemir donne a

could Mr. R. find in the Perſian hiſtories any other more certain method to aſcertain the date of the acceſſion even of *Kaicobad* the founder of the *ſecond* race of Perſian kings, than by allowing to the 9 kings of this race 30 years each at an average*. The truth may poſſibly be, that the genealogy of Xerxes in Herodotus is the groundwork of the firſt race of Perſian kings, whom later traditions have loaded with many Romances. Xerxes there calls himſelf "The ſon of Darius, the ſon of Hyſtaſpes, the ſon of Arſamnes, the ſon of Ariamnes, the ſon of Teiſpeûs, the ſon of Cyrus, the ſon of Cambyſes, the ſon of Achæmenes." *B.* 7. If this Cambyſes was the firſt of this race, who was really king, then Darius (*i. e.* Feridin) would be the 7th king†. Now this

Giamſchid pour miniſtres deux grands Perſonages, l'un le Juif Iſſouf, & l'autre Grec, le ſecond ſe nommoit *Fithagores*, qui eſt Pythagoras. *(at word Giamſchid)*. Il faudroit qu'Afraſiab eut vecu au moins trois ou quatre cens ans pour avoir pu faire toutes les expeditions militaires, que nous ont vu *(at word Afraſiab in Herbelot)*.

* "The æra of Kaicobad cannot be preciſely fixed —If 30 years are allowed as a medium of each reign, it may probably have commenced 600 years before Chriſt." *p.* 40.

† Feridun filium [vel nepotem] Gjemxidis faciunt 7m. Perſarum regem Perſæ. *Galii not. Alfrag. p.* 21.

oldeſt

oldeſt Cambyſes may probably be the great king Gjemſchid ſo much reverenced by the Perſians; there is even great appearance, that the Greeks may have formed the very name *Cambyſis* out of the Perſian of *Gemſchidis*: but as Cyrus's father was likewiſe called *Cambyſes*, as well as his ſon and ſucceſſor Cambyſes alſo, theſe three different perſons of the ſame name may have been often confounded in the Perſian romances: we ſhall find a like confuſion again of the two kings *Artaxerxes* under the ſame name of king *Ardeſhir*. Mr. R. indeed aſſerts, that there is no apparent correſpondence between theſe Greek and Perſian names*; yet in another place he himſelf proves the contrary; for he calls the founder of the ſecond Perſian monarchy *Ardeſhir Babegan* (p. 16): Now the ſame founder was called *Artaxerxes* by the Greeks; if then the Greeks corrupted *Ardeſhir* into *Artaxerxes* in this laſt caſe, why not alſo in the caſe of *Ardeſhir Dirazdeſt*, i. e. *Artaxerxes Longimanus*; nay Mr. R. himſelf effectually proves

* The king in the Perſian hiſtories ſuppoſed to correſpond with Artaxerxes Longimanus is *Ardeſhir Dirazdeſt*; but excepting the initials, there is not a correſponding letter in the words; nor any circumſtance in *ſound* or *ſenſe*, that can juſtify ſuch a corruption. *Note to p.* 84.

the identity of these two, and that even the one name also has a corresponding *sense* to the other. For he says, "Ardeshir Dirazdest implies the strong lion with the *long hands*" (*note to p.* 14). This is the very *sense* of Longimanus. He says moreover, *p.* 48, "That this *Dirazdest* (*i. e.* Bahaman) married his own daughter Homai;" but it was really Artaxerxes 2d, called Mnemon, not Longimanus, who married his own two daughters: here again then we find traces of the actions of the 2d Artaxerxes being applied to the name of the first: and this confusion appears again in regard to Queen *Homai*, whose history has great resemblance to that of Queen *Parysatis*; but the latter was sister to Longimanus not daughter to Mnemon, and like Queen Homai, "being averse to the distant prospect of resigning sovereign power," she did in fact rule in a great degree during the whole reign of her son Artaxerxes 2d as well as before during the life of her husband Darius 2d. These examples therefore shew, that we are not to wonder, if many actions be confusedly ascribed also to Gjemschid, Dahac and Feridin inconsistent with the real history as well as Chronology of Cambyses, Smerdis, and Darius

Darius Hyſtaſpis*: I may add ſtill farther, that the meaning of the very name *Homai* ſeems again to confirm the identity of this queen with Paryſatis: For Mr. R. informs us that "Homai ſignifies *a bird of Paradiſe*." *Note to p.* 51. This probably was meant to imply the ſame as a rare or curious bird, and the name ſmells ſtrong of having been invented ſo late as ſince the introduction of Mahometiſm into Perſia. But however that be, the ſtory itſelf, referred to apparently by the name, is an antient one aſcribed to Paryſatis. To the account of Cteſias below concerning the poiſoning of queen Statira by Paryſatis through the means of a curious bird†, Plutarch adds,

* Strabo intimates, that Cambyſes was really ſlain by Smerdis, not as in other authors, that he killed himſelf by an accident. *Lib.* 15. *ap. fin.*

† Statira [uxor Artaxerxis] a matre Regis Paryſatide fuit veneno necata hunc in modum. Cavebat Statira diligenter ab hoc malo, quod tamen ei contigit; nam una pars cultelli veneno ſuperillinitur, cujus altera pars intacta remanſit: hoc ſecatur *avicula parva*, ovi habens magnitudinem (aviculam hanc Ryndacem Perſæ appellant) dividiturque in duas partes: & ipſa Paryſatis dimidiam partem, quæ veneno carebat, accepit, comeditque; at partem veneno tinctam porrexit Statiræ. Illa, quum eam, quæ porrexerat, edere dimidiam partem vidiſſet, nec quicquam fraudis animadvertere potuiſſet, ipſa quoque una mortiferum comedit venenum. *Cteſiæ Excerpt. apud Photium.*

that

that this *bird* omni caret excremento, habet que inteſtina omnia adipe differta; unde vento arbitrantur Perſæ & rore hoc animal vivere *(in Artaxer.)*: theſe circumſtances ſufficiently ſhew it to have been eſteemed by the Perſians a curious bird as well as a dainty; and from this ingeniouſly wicked invention of Paryſatis, ſhe might obtain in Perſia the nick name of the *Bird of Paradiſe:* for we can expect nothing more than to be able to diſcern ſome few faint glimmerings of antient facts amidſt the darkneſs and extravagance of traditional poetic fictions in modern Perſia.

The above inveſtigations however, upon the whole, enable us to conclude with good reaſon, that much leſs dependance can be placed on the *modern Jewiſh Chronicles*, and *modern Perſian Hiſtories* than on the more antient hiſtoric collections of *Joſephus*; becauſe the laſt did often correct the vulgar errors of his countrymen by means of the more accurate memorials contained in their ſacred ſcriptures and in prophane authors; whereas the Jews and Perſians have ſtill mo e increaſed the confuſion by adding modern errors to an ient ones. That it is no uncommon thing for monſtrous errors in hiſtory as well as chronology to be tranſmitted

mitted by vulgar tradition, eſpecially among a people little acquainted with ſcience and literature, we have ſufficient proof among the Romans: Dionyſius informs us, that many of the Roman hiſtorians fixed the firſt entry of the Romans into Sicily with an embaſſy to Syracuſe to have been in the time of Dionyſius the tyrant there, inſtead of Gelo, who reigned 85 years before; on which he obſerves, Videtur, qui primus hoc in temporum tabulas retulit (cujus veſtigia ſecuti ſunt cæteri) non ſcrutatus *Græcorum hiſtorias*, quis tum Siciliæ fuerit tyrannus, ſine ullo examine, *Dionyſii* nomen quod forte ocurrebat, poſuiſſe. *(lib. 7. 1.)* But Mr. R. has committed a greater fault, than this of preferring the leaſt credible authorities; for he has not repreſented agreeably to truth the facts contained in his own authorities. We have ſeen ſome indications of this in regard to the Jewiſh and Perſian Chronicles; but with reſpect to Joſephus, the ſcriptures themſelves and modern commentators his deviation from the real truth of facts is ſtill more notorious, as I ſhall proceed to ſhew.

Now that our commentators and ſcriptural hiſtorians have fallen into ſome miſtakes is the very object of my *reſearches* to aſcertain;

aſcertain; but they are not of ſuch a kind as Mr. R. pretends, which tend to overturn the whole ſyſtem of their chronologic expoſitions; for they amount to anachroniſms of a few years only; which, when corrected, confirm ſtill more ſtrongly the ſolidity of their general plan of expoſition: they are alſo not errors of their own fanciful invention merely, but into which they have been chiefly miſled by following too cloſely, like the antient chriſtians, the erroneous accounts of Joſephus and the Jews themſelves, in preference to the teſtimony of Scripture and of prophane authors: they are therefore only the laſt obſolete relics of authorized miſtakes, which even the more accurate critical inquiries of this free age of literature have not hitherto been able intirely to expel from the connexion of ſacred and prophane hiſtory. Whereas Mr. R. aſſerts that the ſacred chronology of the moderns "is in direct oppoſition to *ſcripture*, to *Joſephus* and to all obſervation on the *longevity of man*;" and he proceeds to produce the *particular* caſe of Cyrus as one and a capital proof of the truth of theſe aſſertions; let us then join iſſue on this point, and by this example judge of the validity of the reſt.

Firſt in regard to *Joſephus*, the above *general* aſſertion muſt be thought by all readers

ers to mean that it is applicable to this *particular* caſe of Cyrus; and that Joſephus either has not like our commentators explained the *Coreſh* of ſcripture to be the Greek Cyrus the Great; or elſe that he has placed him at not more than 54 years before Alexander's conqueſt of Perſia, like the Jewiſh and Perſian Chronicles inſtead of 207 years; or elſe that Joſephus like them makes the building of the temple to be finiſhed only 34 years before Alexander: ſome one or all of theſe facts muſt be thought neceſſarily *meant* in the above *general* aſſertion, but at leaſt the laſt is directly *expreſſed* by Mr. R. afterwards; and yet not any one of theſe facts is true, nor the leaſt ſyllable tending thereto to be found in Joſephus. On the contrary, the ſubjoined quotations will prove, that Joſephus is the very guide whom our commentators have followed in explaining Cyrus, the father of Cambyſes, to be the *Coreſh* propheſied of by Iſaiah, and the releaſer of the Jews from captivity*: they

* Dum Judæi fundamenta templi jaciunt—*cyrus* in Maſſegetico bello periit (11. 2.)—*Cambyſes* deinde in *paternum* principatum ſucceſſit, per *ſexennium* regnavit; —*Magi* poſt obitum ejus regnum per integrum annum occupaverunt: ſeptem Perſarum familiæ *Hyſtaſpis* filium *Darium* regem declaraverunt. Is adhuc privatus voverat Deo ſacra vaſa apud Babylonem remiſſurun ſe

equally prove that the temple was according to Joſephus begun under Cyrus, and *finiſhed* within leſs than the *ſeventh* year of *Darius Hyſtaſpis* agreeably to *ſcripture* and our commentators*. Neither is it fact, that Joſephus places Cyrus 54 years only before Alexander; on the contrary, by ſeveral computations, he fixes the delivery of the Jews by Cyrus 31 years ſooner than our commentators, that is, at 238 years before Alexander. When he mentions the capture of Jeruſalem by Titus, he gives us the moſt obvious date of the delivery of the Jews from captivity under Cyrus of any to be met with in his works; he ſays there, "That from the building of the 2d temple under Haggai in the 2d year of Cyrus, down to the capture of Jeruſalem in the 2d year of the emperor Veſpaſian were 639 years and

in templum Hieroſolyma—hoc modo templi ædificatio juxta mandata *Cyri* & *Darii* abſoluta eſt intra *ſeptennium*; *nono* autem *Darii* anno ſacerdotes obtulerunt ſacrificia pro renovata poſt *Captivitatem* priſtina felicitate proque *novo* templo. *Joſeph. lib.* 11. 4.

* This houſe was *finiſhed* on the 3d day of the month Adar, which was in the ſixth year of the reign of Darius the king—and the children of the captivity kept the paſſover upon the 14th day of the *firſt* month." *Ezra* vi. 15 *and* 19. Adar was the 12th month, therefore the *firſt* month mentioned afterwards might be the beginning of Darius's ſeventh year.

45 days*." Now Jeruſalem was taken by Titus in the 70th year after Chriſt, which deducted from 639 leaves 569 years before Chriſt for the date of 2d year of Cyrus and delivery of the Jews, which is 31 years earlier than by our commentators in 538; and there is no reaſon to ſuppoſe any error in the figures, for they are confirmed by ſeveral other computations. Neither laſtly is it a true fact (although Mr. R. expreſsly aſſerts it) that "Joſephus finiſhes the building of the temple only about 34 years before the fall of the Perſian empire," for we may ſee in the ſubjoined notes, that he ſays it was finiſhed in the 7th of Darius Hyſtaſpis, whom he makes to follow Smerdis, and this king to ſucceed Cambyſes, the reigns of both together amounting only to 7 years after the death of Cyrus. To theſe add the 7 of Darius, and Mr. R's 34 before Alexander, in all 48; which deducted from 238 would conſequently leave 190 years for the reign of Cyrus in Joſephus according to Mr. R's aſſertion; a contradiction to the longe-

* A poſteriore ſtructione templi, quam ſecundo, anno Cyri Regis Aggæus fecerat, uſque ad excidium quod Veſpaſiani ſecundo anno ſuſtinuit civitas, ann. ſex centi triginta novem, & dies quadraginta quinque *Bell. Jud. lib.* 7. *c.* 10.

vity of man, nothing like which is to be found in our commentators, nor indeed in Joſephus either.

Secondly, then, let us examine how Mr. R. proves againſt our commentators any pretended *contradiction to longevity* and to *ſcripture*. He ſays, "That by the common ſyſtem Sanballat muſt have exceeded 200 years of age at the time of Alexander:" he muſt then ſuppoſe Sanballat to have lived under Cyrus; for the common ſyſtem makes it only 207 years from Cyrus's conqueſt of Babylon to Alexander's conqueſt of Perſia: but it is not fact, that any commentator ever aſſerted ſuch a thing, as that Sanballat lived under Cyrus; how then does it appear that he has been made to exceed 200 years of age? Joſephus, indeed, *ought to have* made him exceed 134; becauſe he ought to have placed him in the 20th year of Xerxes (466 *before Chriſt*) where he fixes Ezra and Nehemiah, under the laſt of whom Sanballat is for the firſt time mentioned in ſcripture. But none, except Jackſon, have ever agreed with Joſephus in this error in regard to Nehemiah's date. The moſt approved ſyſtems place Nehemiah's journey to Jeruſalem and conſequently Sanballat in the 20th of Artaxerxes 1ſt; which

is only 113 years before Alexander: ſome few not until the 20th of Artaxerxes 2d, which would be only 54 years before Alexander, but this opinion is now exploded. It is however true, that 113 years added to Sanballat's age at that time, though no abſolute contradiction to natural longevity, is nevertheleſs very improbable, notwithſtanding that, as Joſephus ſays, he died ſoon after *Valde ſenior:* but the cauſe of this objection is probably another error of Joſephus, in having made Sanballat to be alive, ſo late as under Alexander, and in having made Jaddua to be high prieſt ſo late alſo; neither of which ſeem agreeable to truth for many reaſons; particularly becauſe Nehemiah appears (though not with abſolute certainty) to mention Jaddua as being high prieſt before the end of the reign of Darius the Perſian, that is, the 2d, 73 years before Alexander*. If then there be any improbable longevity in this caſe, it is not becauſe the commentators *have forced ſcripture to agree with their own imaginary eras*; but becauſe ſome have forced both ſcripture and their

* The Levites in the days of Eliaſhib, Jojada, and Johanan and Jaddua were recorded chief of the fathers: alſo the prieſts to the reign of Darius the Perſian. 12. 22.

own

own eras to agree with the wild tales of Josephus and Jewish traditions, which they ought rather to have rejected, as here Prideaux justly does. And why should not Josephus be just as capable of misplacing Jaddua and Sanballat about 40 years *too late*, as of misplacing the return from captivity 31 years *too soon*, or again of placing Nehemiah 21 years *too soon*, by fixing him in the time of Xerxes, which Mr. R. says, "Is impossible to be true?*" Why should not Josephus be capable of not rightly recollecting antient histories, and hereby placing Sanballat during Alexander's invasion of Egypt, instead of some of those other several invasions of it under Artaxerxes 2d or Ochus about 40 years before? Do we not find Mr. R. not rightly recollecting whether our commentators had placed Sanballat at 200 years or only 113 before Alexander, that is, 87 years sooner than they really have done, and 67 years sooner than he himself says in his 2d edition is *possible*, yet this error of 200 stands there uncorrected. Why again should not Josephus be able to err in this

* "In Nehemiah Artaxerxes is written *Artesesta*, and Jackson (v. 1. p. 454) supposes him to be Xerxes; which as will be shewn hereafter is impossible." *Addition in 2d edition to note at p.* 84.

two article

article of history as well as date, when he has erred as much in another article of history as easy to have been corrected, by placing the return of the Jews at the accession of Cyrus instead of his 20th year, and in fifty other instances, some of which are pointed out by Prideaux (ann. 458)? In truth it would be unnecessary to add a syllable more concerning the repeated mistakes in this passage of Mr. R. if it were not rather done with a view of enabling ourselves by these instances to form just notions of the inaccuracy of Josephus both in facts and dates; which we have reason to think, would have been still greater, if he had not sometimes corrected the Jewish traditions by prophane authors. He even leaves it in doubt, whether it be the same Sanballat as the person mentioned in Nehemiah; and if it be, yet at best he separates him from the age of Nehemiah, and places him not less than 134 years later, which is alone a sufficient proof against his testimony. Moreover this tale about Sanballat is *one* out of the only *two* historic events, which Josephus had collected to supply that total *void* in scripture of above 100 years between Nehemiah and the book of Macchabees; which by shewing the scantiness of his materials

terials when unſupported by ſcripture, ſhews their uncertainty likewiſe, and both renders them more eaſy to be miſplaced and himſelf more difficult to be convicted. However there is at leaſt poſitive teſtimony ſtill extant againſt Jaddua's being high prieſt ſo late; for although Euſebius indeed follows Joſephus in this error, yet the Paſchal Chronicon does not; but fixes the ſucceſſor Onias in the high prieſthood 13 years before his date of Alexander's conqueſt of Egypt. This Chronicon might have had ſome better authority for this fact than what Joſephus followed; and if not, yet it juſtifies Newton from dealing in mere conjecture, as Mr. R. alledges, when he ſaid, "That it was not Jaddua who met Alexander but ſome later high prieſt [either Onias or] Simeon*;" for we ſee that there is poſitive teſtimony to this aſſertion of Newton. Laſtly, Joſephus mentions ſome other circumſtances, which demonſtrably prove, either that the Sanballat in the time of Alexander could not be the ſame perſon mentioned in Nehemiah as oppoſing his building the walls

* "Simeon Juſtus ſhould be the high prieſt who met Alexander." *Newton's Chron. p.* 358. and Mr. R's note to *p.* 74.

of

of Jeruſalem but his ſon; or elſe that Joſephus muſt have placed him too late, in making him ſtill alive in the time of Alexander: For Nehemiah ſays, that Sanballat's daughter was married to one of the ſons of Jojada*; whereas Joſephus ſays, that Sanballat's daughter was married to Manaſſes ſon of Johanan and grandſon of Jojada. It is indeed poſſible that *ſon* in Nehemiah may mean no more than *deſcendent*; but not probable, becauſe Eliaſhib is mentioned as ſtill alive; whoſe grandſon Johanan, muſt have had a 2d ſon then married. However, the following fact is impoſſible to be thus evaded. Nehemiah mentions this marriage as having ſubſiſted during his own time: whereas Joſephus ſays, "That his Sanballat was not ſent into Samaria as governor until the reign of Darius the 3d (Codomannus) the *laſt* Perſian King, and that this marriage did not take place until *after* this event†." Nothing

* "One of the ſons of Jojada, the ſon of Eliaſhib the high prieſt, was ſon in law to Sanballat: therefore I chaſed him from me." *Neh.* xiii. 28.

† Mortuo Johanne, pontificatum accepit filius ejus Jaddus, huic quoque frater fuit Manaſſes, cui Sanballetes, miſſus in Samariam ut Satrapa a Dario *rege ultimo*--libenter nuptum dedit filiam Nicaſo. *Antiqu.* 11. 7.

can prove more clearly, than that if this be Nehemiah's Sanballat, Joſephus muſt have ſunk all that *void* in ſcripture of 73 years between Nehemiah (in caſe he writ his book at the end of Darius the 2d) and Alexander's conqueſt of Darius 3d.

But moreover, if we ſhould even grant, that Jaddua was alive ſo late as Alexander, yet neither does this produce any offence againſt natural *longevity* in the whole liſt of high prieſts, as Mr. R. again pretends. For he aſſerts erroneouſly, that Jaddua was only in his *ſeventh* year of prieſthood when he met Alexander, but it is not fact that any ſuch thing is mentioned by Joſephus: his objection then of 45 years of prieſthood, as being too much to allow at an average to each of the Jewiſh high prieſts, is again without foundation: for neither is the fact true, that we have any knowledge of Jeſhua's being *advanced in age*, when he led the Jews home from captivity: Prideaux, indeed, erroneouſly aſſerts this*; but Pri-

* "Jeſhua the high prieſt had ſons, who worked at the temple and were 20 years old and upward; ſee Ezra. iii. 8." *(Prideaux at year before Chriſt* 458). But Patrick juſtly ſays, this was not the high prieſt; for ſee the ſame mentioned again, Ezra. ii. 40. and *Nehem.* viii. 7. and ix. 5.

deaux

deaux has quoted a verſe of Ezra to prove it which relates to a very different perſon, of the ſame name indeed *Jeſhua*, but the head of a family of Levites, and not the high prieſt, as Tremellius, Patrick, and all others allow in their notes. The ſix high prieſts then, Jeſhua, Jojakim, Eliaſhib, Jojada, Johanan, and Jaddua ruled 207 years, viz. from Cyrus's conqueſt of Babylon to that by Alexander, and Jaddua is mentioned by Joſephus as dead ſoon after; which is only about 35 years at an average, even ſuppoſing that Joſephus has *not* placed Jaddua too late. Now ſuch an average of 35 years each Mr. R. himſelf allows in fact to the firſt 6 out of 9 Perſian reigns in the 2d race, although he allows but 30 at an average to the whole 9 (compare p. 77 with p. 40); this therefore cannot be called *a term far exceeding all probability*.

Still farther, while Mr. R. accuſes commentators and chronologers of being in oppoſition to *ſcripture*, it is in truth manifeſt that he himſelf is rather to be accuſed of this defect: for he confounds together the *finiſhing of the building of the temple*, with the *building up of the walls of the city*; to the former Sanballat gave no interruption, for it was finiſhed long before he was

born, viz. in the 6th of Darius Hyſtaſpis; and the latter was firſt effected by Nehemiah 70 years after, to which alone Sanballat made oppoſition as related in Nehemiah. Mr. R. has ſo ſtrangely confounded together theſe different events, that he ſeems to have never attended to the contents of Ezra and Nehemiah. Ezra firſt gives an account of the return of the Jews, the building the temple and the oppoſition made to it by the Samaritans, all which happened long before his own age; then he relates his own Journey from Babylon to Jeruſalem in the 7th of Artaxerxes 1ſt, in order to carry the king's preſents *to beautify the houſe of God* (vii. 27.) which plainly ſuppoſes it already built. In the 20th of the ſame king Nehemiah went to Jeruſalem to *build up the walls of the city* (ii. 17.) in which he was firſt oppoſed by Sanballat.

Upon the whole then, the truth ſeems to be, that the Jewiſh Chronicles as well as Perſian Hiſtories have confounded theſe different events and different kings juſt as Mr. R. has done; for the 20th of Artaxerxes 2d being 54 years only before Alexander, and they, confounding him with Artaxerxes 1ſt, have hence brought down thus late the *building of the walls* by Nehemiah,

miah, and confounded this laſt event with a former one of *building the temple* by Jeſhua in 6th of Darius 1ſt, 130 years before; and this again they have confounded with the *edict* for building it granted to Jeſhua by Cyrus at the delivery from captivity 20 years ſtill ſooner, but never executed until the 2d of Darius. This then ſeems to unravel all the myſtery of confuſion, which the Jewiſh Chronicles and Mr. R. have made in a narration of events, which is ſufficiently explicit, as related in Ezra and Nehemiah, if read with attention and with a deſire to find out the real truth, rather than of ſtarting objections and ſtartling the ignorant with a pretended appearance of perplexity in ſacred hiſtory produced only by one's own confuſion, by a confident aſſertion of a long liſt of facts deſtitute of truth, and of inconcluſive reaſonings from them. It is a great misfortune to literature, when men of learning and ingenuity thus engage in a ſubject which they have not ſufficiently explored, and hereby involve it in ſtill greater obſcurity by altercation, inſtead of rather applying thoſe talents of capacity to remove former difficulties, and thus draw truth out of the maze of error, and light out of darkneſs, doubt

and

and diſputation. I might ſtill add a long liſt of ſimilar miſtakes in Mr. R. concerning this and other ſubjects, but theſe ſpecimens are ſufficient for my purpoſe, which was only to ſhew that the foundations of his ſyſtem are too unſolid and the materials too incoherent to ſtop us any longer in the progreſs of our chronologic enquiries.

It muſt however be acknowledged, that Mr. R. is not ſingular in regard to this confuſion of kings and events mentioned in Ezra and Nehemiah: for the beſt chronologers and commentators, Petavius, Uſher, Prideaux, le Clerk, and Patrick have ſet him too frequent examples of the ſame conduct; and yet the narration of events in both thoſe ſacred writers ſeems in reality ſo very clear and even methodical, that I have often wondered how ſo many acute men could miſs their way. It may be proper then juſt to add a brief abſtract of the ſeries of kings and events in thoſe chapters liable to doubt. Ezra begins his 4th chapter with relating the oppoſition made by the Samaritans to *rebuilding the temple* at the return of the Jews, in the 2d of Cyrus; then in 5th verſe he purſues this ſubject by relating the farther oppoſition made for 20 years down to the reign of Darius

rius Hyſtaſpis. This leads him, in verſe 6, to another event nearly connected with the foregoing ſubject, that is, to relate the ſubſequent oppoſition made (*after rebuilding the temple* under Darius) to rebuilding the *walls of the city*; to which alone all the ſubſequent narration in this chapter refers*, until the very laſt verſe, which ought rather to have begun the following chapter 5: Hence it follows, that *Ahaſuerus*, in verſe 6, muſt be a later king than Darius, and not as le Clerk and others ſuppoſe one between Cyrus and Darius; therefore he can be no other than *Xerxes*, which is the ſame name though not perſon with the Greek *Cy-axares*, who is called *Ahaſuerus* in Daniel ix. 1.† Ezra next relates the like oppoſition under Xerxes's ſucceſſor Artaxerxes, in the beginning of his reign, before the 7th year; of which the effect was, that Artaxerxes forbad at that time rebuilding the *walls*, and the Samaritans made *this work ceaſe by force and power*. (verſe 23.) From 6th verſe then unto the end of the 23d there is not a ſyllable relative to any

* "Be it known unto the king, that if this city be built and the *walls* ſet up again they will not pay toll." ver. 13.

† Again in Tobit xiv. 15.

thing

thing more than rebuilding the *walls of the city, long after* the *temple* had been already rebuilt.

Ezra having thus brought down his narration of the oppoſition by the Samaritans, from Cyrus until his own time in the 7th of Artaxerxes, firſt to the *temple* and afterwards to the *city walls*, reſumes the ſubject of the *temple* which he had before but briefly mentioned in verſe 5, and relates minutely all the circumſtances attending the rebuilding it under Darius Hyſtaſpis; beginning at verſe 24 with a recapitulation of what he had ſaid before in verſe 5, to the following purport: "Thus then (as already mentioned at ver. 5.) ceaſed the work of the *houſe* of God till the 2d of Darius. Then roſe up Zerubbabel and began to build the houſe of God, &c." That the words *then ceaſed* do not refer (as commentators erroneouſly ſuppoſe) to the immediately preceding 23d verſe is evident; for the ſubject *concluded* there, and quite down from the 6th verſe, related only to the oppoſition made to rebuilding the *walls*, and not the *houſe of God:* they muſt refer then to the 5th verſe, wherein mention was laſt made of this oppoſition which *began* againſt the *houſe of God*, but after

the

the reign of Darius was *continued* only againſt making Jeruſalem a city again with defenſive *walls*. Theſe are two very different things in their nature; for the greateſt enemies to Jeruſalem's being a fortified town again, might nevertheleſs reverence the worſhip of the Deity there; as we actually find to have been the caſe with Artaxerxes, who, when he had refuſed to permit the *walls* to be rebuilt, yet ſent Ezra with preſents to *beautify the houſe of God*. At the 24th verſe therefore it is plain, that a new chapter ought to have commenced, along with the new ſubject of a narration of the circumſtances attending the ſucceſsful events of Rebuilding firſt the *temple* and then the *walls*; which ought naturally to follow and not precede the author's account of the oppoſition partly ſucceſsful and partly not, made by the Samaritans againſt both the *temple* and *walls*. This arrangement then of the events according to the ſimilar nature of their *ſubjects* is clear and even methodical; and has been rendered confuſed only by an ill-grounded ſuppoſition, that all theſe events might be expected to be arranged agreeably to the order of *time* rather than that of *ſimilar ſubjects*, and alſo by making the 24th verſe conclude the

ſubject of effectual oppoſition to the *walls*, inſtead of beginning the following ſubject of ineffectual oppoſition to the *temple*.

Having in 5th and 6th chapters related *at large* all the concomitant events concerning building of the *temple* under Darius, he comes in chapter 7 to relate his own Journey from Babylon to Jeruſalem, to carry a donation from Artaxerxes *to beautify the houſe of God*, ver. 27. Although Artaxerxes had liſtened to the complaints of the Samaritans ſo as to order the Jews not to rebuild the *city walls*, yet this did not prevent him from aſſiſting, out of reſpect to the edicts of his predeceſſors Cyrus and Darius, in adorning the *temple* built long before. Throughout this and the following chapters there is not a word about repairing the *walls* but only the *temple*, except that in Ezra's prayer (c. 9. 9.) he thanks God for giving the Jews *a wall in Judah and Jeruſalem*; but which, as Patrick and moſt others agree, is not rightly tranſlated, and ſignifies literally no more than the *fence of a ſhepherd's fold*; meaning metaphorically an *eſtabliſhment* again in their own land, and is accordingly applied equally to all Judæa as to the city Jeruſalem in particular. Hence it is plain, that when Ezra before in c. 6. 14. ſubjoined

ſubjoined Artaxerxes to Cyrus and Darius as being all kings, who had contributed to execute the commandment for building the *houſe* of God, he means the ſame Artaxerxes in whoſe 7th year Ezra carried the king's donation for that purpoſe to Jeruſalem, as related in the ſeventh chapter in a minute manner; only a brief mention of which he had before made in 14th verſe of preceeding chapter, as Le Clerk and Patrick juſtly explain him. Nehemiah gives us a continuation of Ezra, by adding an account of rebuilding the *city walls* in the 20th of the ſame Artaxerxes, and of the oppoſition ſtill made to it by the Samaritans, and now for the 1ſt time by Sanballat; but now Artaxerxes had changed his mind and reverſed the contrary order made in the commencement of his reign before the 7th year.

Thus then it appears, that the hiſtoric method adopted by Ezra is, to diſtribute his narration into 4 diſtinct *portions*, which if comprehended in 4 chapters would have prevented the confuſion ariſing from the preſent inaccurate diviſions. In the *firſt* he relates the return from captivity and the laying a *foundation* for a temple agreeably to the edict of Cyrus. In the *ſecond* the oppoſition made by the Samaritans to

building the *temple* and afterwards alſo their ſubſequent oppoſition to rebuilding the *city walls* down to his own time. In the *third*, the circumſtances attending the actual rebuilding the *temple* under Darius Hyſtaſpis. In the *fourth* is the narration of his own journey in order to carry the donation of Art: for *beautifying* the temple, and the ſubſequent events; which *fourth* with propriety enough follows the preceeding portion as being a continuation of the foregoing ſubject. To theſe Nehemiah adds a *5th portion* concerning building the *city walls*. Others perhaps might have rather preferred ſuch a method, as ſhould have diſpoſed every event throughout in the right order of time; but this is mere matter of opinion: and accordingly Herodotus compiled his eſteemed hiſtory into connected *portions* in a ſimilar method to that of Ezra; where as Thucydides and Diodorus afterwards preferred a chronologic order. If Mr. R. had rightly attended to this method of Ezra, I am apt to think, that he would not have made the ſubjoined addition to note at p. 84 in his 2d edition*:

* That there were two *different* princes named Artaxerxes in the bible will appear from Ezra and Nehemiah; the firſt was reigning in 522, and the other

But at leaſt it follows hence, that there is no ſuch difficulty as Mr. R. pretends " To account for the ſilence of ſcripture with regard to the intermediate princes *Artax. Mnemon*, *Ochus* and *Arogus*;" for in reality they were not intermediate, but ſubſequent to all the kings mentioned in Ezra and Nehemiah; and moreover " That the endeavours of the learned to reconcile the Perſian kings of ſcripture to the Perſian kings of the Greeks does [not] appear productive of any embarraſſment" (p. 81.): but on the contrary, that they readily coincide, ſo ſoon as the adventitious embarraſſments are removed, which have been introduced by the inattention of ſome readers, and the incoherency of ſome critics; who have attempted to reconcile ſcripture, not only to prophane authors, but at the ſame time to the traditionary Fables of Joſephus and the more modern Jewiſh Chronicles. So that the very preſcription, which Mr. R. recommends as a remedy, is in reallity one principal cauſe of the diſorder complained of; and nothing can prove more ſtrongly the utility and even

other only began to reign in 466 before Chriſt. At the firſt of theſe periods the Greeks fill the throne with Cambyſes. See Ezra 4. 7. and Nehem. 2. 1."

neceſſity

neceſſity of our *reſearches* into the principles of the connection between ſacred and prophane hiſtory, than the occaſion, which Mr. R. takes to recommend ſuch a different ſyſtem of chronology, on account of the preſent errors and little incoherencies introduced by commentators through the cauſes referred to in my introductory ſection: for becauſe they have not always exactly hit the truth, altho' they are but ſeldom very far from it, occaſion is hence taken to deny the exiſtence of any truth whatever in their chief principles, and of any probable or even poſſible connexion between the names, dates and events in ſacred and prophane authors.

I have ſince obſerved, that there is indeed one author, tho' not a commentator, who, like Mr. R. has placed Sanballat under Cyrus (vid. p. 72.); this is the author of *Theolog. Politic. c.* 10. (Spinoza I believe) quoted by Huetius, who thus cenſures his error: "Putat Nehemiam Cyri temporibus floruiſſe qui Artaxerxi equalis fuit." *Dem. Evang. propos.* 4. 4. Thus obſolete objections are ſtarted afreſh, and altho' often exploded introduced again as new.

New conjectures then muſt at worſt be preferable to old miſtakes: conjectures indeed

deed at the motives of actions in kings as well as men in general muſt of neceſſity be very precarious, and I am not inclined to deal merely in conjectures; however it is more excuſable in regard to motives than events, becauſe it is a knowledge which can be ſeldom acquired except by conjecture, and the greateſt part of hiſtoric events are connected together by motives, which have little better foundation. I ſhall therefore conclude with venturing to point out ſome probable motives, why Artaxerxes in his 20th year might grant that Licence to Nehemiah of rebuilding the *city walls*, which he had refuſed in the beginning of his reign, and did not even grant to Ezra in his 7th year, when he teſtified his piety to the Deity of the Jews: the more ſo as it is a ſubject, which I have never ſeen touched upon, which however the hiſtory of thoſe times has preſerved, and which will help to confirm the preceding chronologic expoſition of Ezra and Nehemiah; by ſhewing that the changes in the conduct of the ſame king Artaxerxes with reſpect to Jewiſh affairs were not the effect of mere fickleneſs or of domeſtic or uxorious favoritiſm, as Prideaux ſuggeſts, but of political alterations in the ſituation of

public

public affairs at thoſe ſeveral periods of his reign. This has hitherto been witheld from our view chiefly through the corruptions, which Petavius, Uſher, and Prideaux have for various unſolid reaſons ſeverally introduced in the dates of events during the reign of Artaxerxes, and which neither the Univ. Hiſt. nor Blair have corrected but increaſed. By the Chaldæan æra the 1ſt of Artaxerxes in 284 is conumerary with the year before Chriſt 464, as Prideaux, and others (except Petavius and Uſher) rightly place him, therefore it coincides with 1ſt year of 79th olymp. in which year Diodorus alſo has rightly placed the acceſſion of Artaxerxes: He adds, that the Egyptians rebelled under Inarus immediately on hearing of the death of Xerxes*; In his third year Achæmenes was ſent to reduce Egypt; but was defeated, ſurrounded and beſieged; yet relieved by Megabyſus with another Perſian army in the 1ſt of 80th ol. (as Diodorus relates) which was therefore the 5th year of Artaxerxes. The Athenian Auxiliaries retired to an Iſland and defended themſelves in Egypt only *a year*

* Egyptii audita Xerxis morte & perturbatione regni Perſarum a Perſis deficiunt. *lib.* 11.

and

and half longer, (as Thucyd. ſays); and he adds that the whole war laſted 6 years; it was therefore nearly or compleatly finiſhed at the end of the 6th of Artaxerxes, (459 before Chriſt) and *before* Ezra in the 7th went up to Jeruſalem*. Petavius for a reaſon pretended to be afforded by Thucydides but deſtitute of force, has placed the end of this rebellion 3 years ſtill later (viz. at 456 bef. Chriſt) Uſher 5 years later, for a ſimilar reaſon, viz. at 454, and even later than the journey of Nehemiah to rebuild the walls, which brings confuſion into the whole hiſtory: in the firſt of theſe errors he has been followed by Prideaux, and in both by Univ. Hiſt. where the final reduction of Egypt is placed 6 years later (453): thus errors increaſe as books increaſe. This event of the rebellion in Egypt at the acceſſion of Artaxerxes ſufficiently indicates why he refuſed leave to build the *walls* of Jeruſalem at the beginning of his reign; after he had been informed by the Samaritans, "That the Jews were building the rebellious city, had ſet up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations; that if this city be built and the walls ſet up again, then they will not pay toll, tribute, and cuſtom. Now

* Calviſius and Helvicus have not prolonged the Egyptian rebellion beyond 460, like Diodorus.

becauſe it was not meet for us to ſee the king's diſhonour, we have therefore certified, that if ſearch be made in the records of thy fathers, thou wilt know, that this city is a rebellious city and hurtful unto kings and provinces, and that they have moved ſedition within the ſame of old time; for which cauſe this city was deſtroyed, and if the walls be ſet up again, by this means thou ſhalt have no portion on this ſide the river Euphrates." *Ezra* iv. 12. The Samaritans could not have choſen a fitter opportunity or argument to interrupt the *walls* of Jeruſalem, than what they thus employed during the rebellion in Egypt. The king's anſwer ſhews how forcibly it ſtruck him at that time. "It is found, that this city of old time hath made inſurrection againſt kings; there have been mighty kings alſo over Jeruſalem, who have ruled over all beyond the river, and toll, tribute and cuſtom was paid to them." In this memorial and the anſwer, we almoſt read the thoughts and fears of Artaxerxes, leſt the Jews ſhould follow the rebellious example of Egypt, and refuſe tribute to the king; which might ſtop up all paſſage through Paleſtine, either for the Perſian army to retreat, or for any other to march to its relief and the reduction of Egypt. But

at his 7th year Egypt was reduced, if not alſo the Athenian Auxiliaries intirely expelled from their ſtrong hold in the Iſland: Ezra's Journey therefore in that year carries with it the appearance of a donation of gratitude from the king to the God of Iſrael for the happy reduction of Egypt; and poſſibly to expreſs alſo his ſatisfaction in the conduct of the Jews for the aſſiſtance in proviſions and neceſſaries, which they probably afforded the great Perſian army of 200,000 men in their march through Paleſtine to the reduction of Egypt. That the motive of Ezra's journey was of a political as well as religious kind, and had a broader foundation than the ſuppoſed influence of Eſther, is ſufficiently evident from the contents of the king's letter, which ſpecifies, that he was ſent not only by the king "but by his ſeven councillors to *enquire* concerning Judah and Jeruſalem and to carry the donation, which the councillors as well as king had freely offered to the God of Iſrael in order to buy bullocks and rams to offer a ſacrifice upon the altar of the God; for *why ſhould there be wrath* againſt the *realm* of the king and his ſons." Either the war was not now altogether finiſhed, and the ſacrifice was intended to

deprecate the paſt wrath of the Deity; or elſe it was compleatly finiſhed, and the donation was intended to prevent his future wrath, and to ſecure the continuance of his propitiouſneſs to the arms and *realm* of Perſia. The addition of *his ſons* ſeems rather to look forward to the peace of the king's poſterity; and the exemption of the prieſts from tribute, together with the extenſive powers Ezra carried with him not only over the treaſurers, but "to appoint magiſtrates to judge all the Jews that are beyond the river, that will not do the law of the king, and the law of their God and to teach the laws of their God, to thoſe that know them not;" theſe things preſent rather the face of a conciliating peace-eſtabliſhment after civil commotions were ended, than of the tumultuous ſeaſon of war; when 200,000 men were to be maintained out of the treaſures and granaries of Paleſtine, and the execution of military rather than divine law was expedient for the province. Yet ſtill there is not a word of permiſſion to be found in Ezra for rebuilding the *walls*; the rebellion in Egypt was yet too recent.

But in the 20th year of this king the ſtate of things was much changed; four years before this date Artaxerxes had made not

not the moſt honourable peace with the Greeks: in this it was ſtipulated, "That the Greek cities throughout Aſia ſhould enjoy their freedom and be governed by their own laws; that no Perſian præfect ſhould come within 3 days journey of any of the coaſts of the ſea [ad mare]; that no large veſſel ſhould ſail between the northmoſt extremity of the coaſt of Aſia Minor and the boundary of Paleſtine*." Thus were the Perſians cut off from the whole coaſt of Aſia Minor at leaſt, both by ſea and land. The extenſive phraſe of *ad mare* ſeems to extend even to the coaſt of Paleſtine alſo with reſpect to the reſtraint of any Perſian præfect's approach. In this ſtate of things, ſince it does not appear whether the Perſians were even permitted to keep garriſons along the coaſt of Paleſtine, a friendly and fortified town in the heart of Paleſtine at more than 3 days journey from the coaſt, ſuch as Jeruſalem, would be neceſſary to preſerve a communication with Egypt, and in any caſe uſeful: to this we may with ſome probability attribute the condeſcenſion of the king in now granting that liberty to Nehemiah to *rebuild the*

* Diod. *lib.* 12. *Olymp.* 82. 4.

walls

walls and fortify the city, which had been refuſed at the critical and tumultuous beginning of his reign. The events then related in Ezra and Nehemiah ſuit ſo conſonantly with the hiſtory, chronology and circumſtances of the reign of Artaxerxes 1ſt, as to add a farther confirmation to the received expoſition of thoſe books by the beſt commentators, when thus corrected.

Having aſſerted, that both Petavius and Uſher have referred to Thucydides as proving what in reality he does not prove, that the reduction of Egypt, &c. ought to be placed three or four years later than Diodorus has placed it*, it ſtill remains to ſhew the unſolidity of this pretended proof, by which Uſher brings down alſo the rebellion in Egypt two years, as well as the reduction 5 years later. By the ſubjoined quotations it appears, that the whole proof for deviating here from Diodorus depends upon a ſuppoſition, that Thucydides has

* Ægyptum ab Artaxerxe receptam Thucydides poſt Tolmidæ Victoriam *memorat*, viz. non ante 1m. 81 ol. 456 ant. Chr. *Doctr. Temp. lib.* 13. *ap. ol.* 81.

Diodorus biennii προχρονισμω *accuratiorem* Thucydideæ *narrationis ſeriem* antevertit de expeditione Achæmenis in Ægyptum, quæ non fuit 3° ann. 79 ol. ſed ante Chr. 460. 1° ann. 80. olym.—Megabyſus Inarum fugat Ann. 456.—Inſulam cepit in 554. *Uſh.*

placed

placed all events in the ſame order of narration as their real order of ſucceſſion; but this is not true with reſpect to the contents of his firſt book, whence theſe examples are taken. At the beginning indeed of his ſecond book where his hiſtory of the Peloponneſian war commences, he expreſſly informs us, "That he ſhall relate every thing in its proper order, by ſummers and winters, according as the events took place," which he accordingly performs: but this promiſe cannot be thought to have retroſpect to the foregoing contents of his firſt book, wherein he makes no ſuch engagement. Neither moroever was it poſſible, on account of the nature of the ſubject of his firſt book, that his narration ſhould agree in all caſes with the right order of events; becauſe it contains a brief ſummary of Grecian tranſactions from the moſt antient times down to the Peloponneſian war; which brevity neceſſarily leads him to finiſh every relation where he begins it, altho' the completion might not happen until many years afterwards. Laſtly, if we examine his particular example we ſhall actually find many, in which the right order of time is deranged in the narration; I ſhall take notice of only

only one, which relates alſo to the preſent ſubject of the rebellion in Egypt. In one paragraph he relates, "The commencement of the ſiege of *Ithome* by the Lacedemonians; and after adding various particulars during the ſiege and concomitant events, he concludes with informing us, that in the 10th year of the ſiege, *Ithome* ſurrendered to the beſiegers, that the beſieged agreed to depart out of Peloponneſus, and were received by the Athenians into Naupactus." The very next paragraph begins with relating "That Inarus cauſed Egypt to rebel againſt Artaxerxes, &c." Now according to the reaſoning of Petavius and Uſher, the ſiege of Ithome muſt have been *finiſhed* before this rebellion in Egypt began: whereas the real fact was, that this rebellion under Inarus commenced in the very ſame year, in which the ſiege of Ithome *began*; as is proved by Pauſanias, who has fortunately preſerved the date of the ſiege of Ithome*. The olympic date indeed in Pauſanias is erroneous: but the concomitant Attic date clears up the olympic one; for both Diodorus and Dionyſius

* Meſſenii a Lacedæmoniis denuo defecerunt unde viceſima ferme Olympiade, quâ Corinthus Xenophon vicit, archonte Athenis Archimede.—In Ithomen montem ſeceſſere, &c. *Lib.* 4. *Meſſeniaca.*

agree,

agree, that Archidemedes was Archon, and Xenophon Victor in the firſt of 79th ol.* and to this Petavius alſo agrees in *lib.* 13. *apud* olymp. 27. Moreover Naupactus was not poſſeſſed by the Athenians, until Tolmides took it from the Spartan allies in 1ſt of 81 Olymp. as Diodorus ſays: conſequently, according to the reaſoning of Petavius, Inarus did not rebel until the 1ſt of 81 Olymp. It is evident therefore, that no certain concluſion can be drawn, (as Petavius and Uſher pretend) that any event happened *later* than ſome other, becauſe Thucydides has happened not to *relate* it until after that other; although he has doubtleſs obſerved even here in his firſt book a chronologic order of narration, as nearly as the nature of a brief ſummary would admit.

And ſtill farther with reſpect to this particular event, the reduction of Egypt by Megabyſus, Thucydides expreſſly ſays, that the tranſactions in Egypt by the Athenians and Megabyſus the Perſian, which he is *going to* relate, happened *during* the

* Archon Archedemides, Olympias agebatur 79, qua ſtadio vicit Xenophon Corinthius. *Diod. l.* 11.

Olympiade 79 vicit Xenophon Corinthius, Archedemide Archonte *Dionyſ. lib.* 9.

Grecian tranſactions, which he had juſt before related in the preceding paragraph, and not *after* them, as Petavius and Uſher pretend*: ſo that they have no good foundation whatever for placing the end of this rebellion 4 or 5 years later than Diodorus; who ought to be believed, until evidence appears to the contrary; and yet chronologers go on blindly to follow the authority of Petavius and Uſher, without examining the ſolidity of their reaſoning.

Thus then *reſearches* into chronologic errors in our modern prophane ſyſtems will often aſſiſt, not only in aſcertaining the right ſeries of kings and events in ſcripture, with their reſpective dates; but will alſo help us to ſome probable political motives, which might give riſe to them, and point out harmony and conſiſtency in the ſcriptural narrations; which in regard to Ezra and Nehemiah, even Prideaux ſometimes unneceſſarily deſtroys, Petavius, Uſher and Univerſal Hiſtory ſtill oftner.

* Οἱ δὲ ἐν τῇ Αἰγυπτῳ Ἀθηναιοι καὶ οἱ ξυμμαχοι ἐτι ἐπεμενον καὶ αὐτοις πολλαι ἰδεαι πολεμων καλεσῆσαν. Now ἐτι ἐπεμενον do not mean, "that the Athenians *ſtaid ſtill* in Egypt after the *laſt actions* in Greece before related under Tolmides in 456. For "allies" and "experienced many changes of war" prove them to mean, "that they and their allies the Egyptians *ſtill ſupported* the war after *that ſucceſs*, which he had before related in 462." Their allies never *left* Egypt.

Table of Events and Dates.

Before Christ.	Year of Nabon.	Olymp. Year.	
569	179		*Cyrus's 2d year over Persia, according to Josephus, in which he delivers the Jews from captivity at Babylon, the 238th before Alexander's accession to Persia.*
560	188	55¼	*Cyrus delivers the Jews according to Africanus, Eusebius, and the old Christians, in this his first year over Persia.*
558	190	55⅔	Cyrus really accedes to Persia in this year.
538	210		*Darius Mede, assisted by Cyrus, takes Babylon according to the modern systems, 207 years before Alexander.*
537	211		Cyrus now really takes Babylon. Jeshua high priest and Zorobabel conduct the Jews home. Edict made to build the temple.
529	219		1st of Cambyses *r.* 8.
521	227		1st. Of Darius 1, son of Hystaspis *r.* 36.
520	228		2d. The Jews obtain leave to rebuild the temple, under Jeshua and Zorobabel, agreeably to the edict of Cyrus.
516	232		6th. The temple finished about February after the end of this year and at beginning of 7th.
485	263		1st. Of Xerxes *r.* 21.
474	274	76⅔	12th. *Artaxerxes admitted partner in the kingdom with Xerxes according to Petavius. Xerxes died in this year according to Usher. Two corruptions made by both on purpose to agree with their explanation of Daniel, tho' 10 years before the real accession of Artaxerxes.*
467	281		*Ezra goes up to Jerusalem in Usher.*
466	282		20th. *Ezra goes up to Jerusalem in Josephus and Jackson.*
464	284	79¼	1st of Artaxerxes 1, called Longimanus, *r.* 41. The Egyptians rebel under Inarus. *Ezra goes to Jerusalem in Univ. History.*
462	286	⅔	3d. Achæmenes sent to subdue Egypt in Diodorus and Petavius.
460	288	80¼	5th. Megabysus relieves Achæmenes and subdues Egypt in Diodorus, who is rightly followed by Calvisius only.
459	289	½	6th. The Athenian Auxiliaries quit Egypt about the end of this Julian year, the 6th. *Achæmenes invades Egypt according to Usher and Prideaux, and Univ. History.*
458	290	⅔	7th. Ezra carries presents to Jerusalem from Artaxerxes and all the Persian Nobles for a sacrifice, in thanks for the happy end of the rebellion in Egypt, and to *beautify the temple.* Eusebius rightly places Ezra's journey here, and is followed by Prideaux. If the Athenian Auxiliaries had not now quitted Egypt, yet at least Egypt was reduced.
456	292	81¼	9th. Tolmides takes Naupactus and burns the naval arsenal of the Lacedemonians. *Megabysus only now subdues Egypt in Petavius, Usher, Prideaux and Univ. History.*
454	294	⅔	11th. *Nehemiah goes up to Jerusalem to rebuild the walls in Petavius, Usher and Univ. History. Athenians quit Egypt in Usher and Prideaux.*
453	295		*The Athenian Auxiliaries quit Egypt in Univ. History.*
449	299	82¾	16th. Artaxerxes makes an inglorious peace with Greece.

Before Christ.	Year of Nabon.	Olymp. Year.	
445	303		20th. Nehemiah is sent to Jerusalem to rebuild the *city walls*, which is now first opposed by Sanballat. Eusebius and the antient Christians place Nehemiah here, and are rightly followed by Prideaux. The 114th year before Alexander's conquest of Egypt and Persia. Eliashib mentioned in Nehemiah as being now high priest. 3. 1.
423	325		1st. Of Darius 2d called Nothus, *r.* 19; in Ezra called Darius the Persian; by which it appears, that Nehemiah did not write his book until after the accession at least of Darius, possibly long after his decease, and before writing it Jaddua was high priest; but this might have been so late as the middle of Artaxerxes 2d; therefore Jaddua if then but lately become high priest, might have been alive at the conquest by Alexander. We have no knowledge of the age of Nehemiah at any period whatever: it is therfore wonderful that Prideaux should weaken the authenticity of this *book* so much, by supposing the 12th Ch. which mentions Jaddua to be an interpolation; for which there is not the least pretence, nor any other correction wanting, than of that error of Josephus in making Sanballat alive under Alexander, which, tho' not impossible, is totally improbable; yet even this is no error, in case he did not mean Nehemiah's Sanballet, but his son.
404	344		1st. Of Artaxerxes 2d, called Mnemon, *r.* 46, Son to Darius and Parysatis, the Daughter of Xerxes: married Statira and also one or two of his own Daughters. Egypt about this time rebelled again under Amyrtæus.
395	353		10th. About this time Nehemiah possibly composed his book, and Jaddua now perhaps entered on the high priesthood. Nehemiah being cup-bearer to the king was probably young in the 20th of Artax. 1. and if so then, would now be only 80: but Jaddua must still have ruled 60 years to be alive under Alex.
385	363		20th. *The Jewish Chronicles confounding together this king with Artax. 1, have misled the Persian Historians, Scaliger and Mr. R. to place Nehemiah's Journey at this date 54 years only before Alexander.*
374	374	101⅔	31st. Pharnabazus invades Egypt *sub ætatis initium* says Diodorus, with both land army and navy; the land army might have approached in winter, yet the navy not until spring. But having not effected any thing material before the Nile began to rise, which is soon after Midsummer, the whole force returned to Syria. This shews, that the invasion under Megabysus before must have ended about Midsummer in the 5th of Artax. 1, and that the year and half more of the Athenian Auxiliaries would expire with his 6th year.
358	390		1st. Of Ochus *r.* 21.
337	411		1st. Of Arrogus *r.* 2.
335	413		1st. Of Darius 3d, called Codomannus, *r.* 4.
331	417	112½	1st. Of Alexander, *r.* 8.

ADDITIONS and CORRECTIONS

In the SECOND VOLUME.

P. 3. At end of 1ſt note *add*, " As the highlanders cut their *hay* chiefly from thoſe few *flat meadows*, which generally are found at the entrance of a river into a loch, or at its exit from the loch, or at the confluence of two rivers, or near the exit of a river into the ſea, it is poſſible, that the Scotch erſe word *ver* and the Welch *gwair*, *hay*, may be the ſame word, as Gibſon has perhaps luckily, though unknowingly, conjectured: but whether the nature of the ſituation, whence the hay is cut, gave name to the produce, or on the contrary the name of the produce to the ſituation of the meadows, whence it is procured, muſt be left to thoſe who thoroughly underſtand the Scotch erſe to determine."

P. 7. l. 12. *Add* in a note, " I ſince find, that M. Whitaker's etymology of *Venta* is only adopted from a conjecture of Baxter."

P. 20. To end of 1ſt note *add*, " This name *Sol-Ente* ſeems to have expreſſed among the Britons the ſame as *South-ampton*, in contradiſtinction to *North-ampton* ſituated on another *Antona* in the north. For Macpherſon informs us (in Hiſt. G. Britt. p. 255.) that *ſolus* in the erſe means *ſun* (in Latin *ſol*). O'Halloran alſo ſays (in Introd. to Hiſt. of Ireland) that in Iriſh *ſol* means *ſun*; this ſeems an abbreviation of *ſolus*: hence then it appears, that *Sol-ente* means *South-antona*.

P. 26. l. 7. *For* " Debuit 20 Pachon," *read*, " Quod *ſi* annus Egyptiacus manſiſſet vagus, prout Perſicus, debuiſſet 20 Pachon, &c." My extract without theſe additional words is too brief to convey the meaning of Golius. See the conſequence in 9th correction. Moreover in my extract of Schickard's words, at p. 25, there ought to have been added his words, *Die Jovis*, after 14 *Sywald*, and that this obſervation was made at Grand Cairo,

P. 32.

P. 32. l. 8. *After* "Which is right," *add*, "for the 15th of May in 979 did really fall on a Thurſday (Fer. 5.)"

P. 34. To firſt note *add*, "In the above computations I have reckoned only 90 days from the beginning of *Di* to the end of the year, which is right; for the 5 epagomenæ were in that age added at the end of the 8th month *Aban*, not at the end of the 12th month *Aſphirer*; as is proved by Alfraganus. *Aban-ma—quinque reliqui dies adjiciuntur ad finem extra menſium ordinem.*" *Aſtr. c.* 2. The practice of adding theſe 5 days to the end of the 12th month was not introduced until the eſtabliſhment of the Gelalean year in 1079.

P. 34. To ſecond note *add*, "In like manner in the chronologic tables of *Ulugh Beigh* publiſhed by Gravius 1650, the æra of Iſdegird commences on the 16th of June in 632.

P. 35. To ſecond note *add*, "None of our common tables of Chronology having given any account of the Julian days on which the ſeveral years of Iſdegird commenced, I was forced to compute them myſelf: but I might have ſaved this trouble if I had known that they are accurately marked by Gravius in *Ulugh Beigh's Epochæ celebriores* abovementioned, and they agree exactly with my computation.

P. 37. Expunge the whole note in this page. It had its riſe from my having been too brief in my extract from Golius to convey his meaning. See it enlarged in the 5th correction before this. Now the *ſuppoſition* there made being admitted, all the ſubſequent dates and computations of Golius are juſt and accurate; but foreign to our purpoſe, except that it follows neceſſarily from them, that in caſe Golius had proceeded to fix the Julian day of this eclipſe, he muſt in conſequence have placed it in the night between the 14th and 15th of May.

M. Freret

M. Freret therefore is miſtaken in ſaying, " That Golius places this eclipſe between the 15th and 16th of May." There are ſo many errors in this paſſage (either of Freret himſelf or the preſs) that I ſhall quote the chief part of it; for the *Memoirs of the Academy* ſeem to be compiled with as little accuracy as the *Philoſop. Trans.* Freret aſſerts, that according to Golius " Ibn Jounes dit, que cette eclipſe avait été obſervée en Egypte la nuit du 15 au 16 Jiar—c'eſt la nuit du 15 au 16 Mai" and that Golius calculates that " Le 29 Ardibehiſt jour de l'eclipſe repondit au 25 du 5me. mois ou du mois Tybi de l'année Egyptienne vague: ce jour repond au 20 Pachon dans l'année fixe 595 de Diocleſian. La difference entre ces deux dates eſt dans l'année vague Egyptienne de 250 jours, comme le prouve Golius par un methode aſſez embarraſſée, qu'il ne s'agit pas de reformer: il ſuffit que la concluſion en ſoit juſte. *Reflex. ſur l'année Romaine par M. Freret, Tom.* 19. *p.* 320. For 29 *Ardibehiſt* we ſhould read 25, &c. and for 595 *de Diocleſian* read 695.

P. 39. In 2d note l. ult. *for* " Vide l." *read* " viz." and at end of it *add*, that the Perſians reckoned their day from ſun riſe is confirmed by Ulugh Beigh, who ſays, " Dies civilis—ſtatuitur ab arabibus & mahommedanis a principio noctis, ab *aliis* ab initio diei." *cap.* 1. Under *aliis* he cannot but include the Perſians, of whom ſome towns and Provinces are at this day remaining in Perſia compoſed of ſcarcely any except profeſſors of Magianiſm.

P. 41. l. 25. After " Errors of the preſs" ſubjoin in a note, " In another obſervation of a ſolar eclipſe quoted by Mr. Coſtard as being in the year of Iſdegird 346, the 12th day of Adur, 18th of Rabia poſter:" for 18 *read* 15. In another obſervation of a ſolar eclipſe, " 347 year of Iſdegird, 9 day

day of Chordad, 8 of Haziran," for 9 *read* 19.— It is obſervable, that moſt of theſe errors conſiſt in a figure 8 being put for 5; through what cauſe I am ignorant, but in the long liſt of *errata* ſubjoined to the ſubſequent vol. none of theſe errors are corrected.

P. 43. note 2. l. 6. For β ωρας read γ ωρας.

P. 44. l. 15. After the words "Credit of Ibn Younes" *ſubjoin* in a note, "He flouriſhed between 996 and 1020, being aſtronomer to the Califf of Egypt, and made his own obſervations at Grand Cairo!

P. 76. In note to the laſt line *add*, "Newton's opinion, that Simeon Juſtus was the high prieſt cotemporary with Alexander is alſo confirmed by a tradition among the Jews themſelves, but whether it is to be found in any of their *Chronicles* I am ignorant; it is thus quoted by Scaliger. *Neque vero Judæi ignorant Sanballeten ſocerum Manaſſis ab Alexandro impetraſſe veniam templi in monte Garizim conſtruendi, eumque eundem eſſe ſatentur, cujus meminerit Nehemias: ſed errant, quum eo tempore Simonem Juſtum ſummum Pontificem fuiſſe arbitrantur, non Jadduam.* Emend. Temp. p. 589. This is ſuch authority as Mr. R. himſelf approves, but at the ſame time it contains another ſtrong proof of the abſurd contradictions which ſubſiſt in the Jewiſh traditions."

Doubts

Doubts concerning the Tranſlation and Notes of the Biſhop of London, to the five firſt Chapters of Iſaiah.

THE *critical obſervations* which have been hitherto made public ſeem all to come under one or other of the three following claſſes: The *firſt* claſs conſiſts of notes ſubjoined to ſome one book or work; conſequently theſe have ſcarcely any other connexion with each other, than that of tending to illuſtrate different paſſages of the ſame work or author. The *ſecond* claſs conſiſts of illuſtrations concerning disjointed paſſages of different works or authors; theſe have conſequently little other connexion than that of being bound up together by the collector in one and the ſame volume. A *third* claſs conſiſts of incidental remarks on various paſſages in different books and authors, introduced by a writer during the progreſs of ſome work of his own, in order to confirm, defend or illuſtrate particular parts of it; theſe acquire a more intimate connexion both with each other and with the chief ſubject than in either of the two foregoing caſes: but they are defective in this reſpect, that they are

generally too brief, and too thinly ſcattered in any work to enable readers to arrive at the proper object of *criticiſm*; which is, to teach others how to form juſt judgments of authors and books and the ſubjects of which they treat. I have therefore thought, that there ſtill remained a method of forming a *fourth* claſs, which ſeems to arrive nearer to the profeſſed end of criticiſm: this is, by propoſing ſome principal ſubject to be illuſtrated, ſuch as that in my *Reſearches* of explaining doubtful and conteſted paſſages in the Jewiſh Scriptures by means of a more accurate ſyſtem of prophane chronology; and in the courſe of ones enquiries and progreſs towards this end in view, by examining into a variety of other inferior ſubjects; which, though underparts, are however neceſſary and intermediate ſteps, on which a reaſoner muſt get firm footing, before we can arrive at any juſt concluſions in regard to that more important and ultimate object of our purſuits. By this method our critical enquiries of neceſſity become intimately connected throughout; they all in ſome degree reſt and depend upon each other, and all the ſeveral parts together aſſiſt in forming the whole into one connected and conſiſtent body of truths.

truths. This method will alſo in courſe engage a writer in an enquiry into a variety of ſubjects and authors, together with the chief of the ſeveral opinions, conjectures or proofs alledged by them concerning any ſuch intermediate ſubject under conſideration; and by ſuch an enlarged view we ſhall be better able to form a juſt judgment of the comparative merit of thoſe different authors, who have before treated of the ſame matter: nay perhaps hereby we ſhall diſcover at laſt what are the truths, to which they might and ought to have arrived through the means of their proofs and principles, but on account of many falſe conjectures intermixed and falſe reaſonings unhappily did not; which truths will often, as it were, of themſelves ſtart up to our view amidſt this colliſion and compariſon of their ſeveral opinions and arguments. To find out only defects in others through a mere pleaſure of detecting defects, is a leſs worthy object of purſuit; but if, while tracing out the numerous ways of error, we ſhall hereby be happily led to diſcover that private, latent, and hitherto undiſcovered path, which alone leads to truth; this will tend to a ſtill better purpoſe than that of juſt remarks on others, by enabling us to

withſtand on good grounds ſeduction into ſpecious and current errors through the names of illuſtrious authors, and inſtead of their ſyſtems of confuſion and contradiction by leading us into the regions of light and truth, amidſt ſurrounding harmony and conſiſtency on all ſides. This *fourth* claſs of critical inquiries will therefore perhaps teach us, that truth is at preſent often but thinly ſcattered throughout many large folios of argumentation: that it viſits in his turn the whole circle of writers, but ſeldom long makes its abode with any one: few indeed are ſo unhappy as not ſometimes to ſtumble upon it, but ſcarce any ſo fortunate as to keep it always in poſſeſſion, and many ſeem ignorant of the prize within their hands, even when they have really obtained it. Laſtly then, this *fourth* claſs of criticiſm will ſerve, not only thus to enable us better to pick out thoſe certain truths, which are hid amidſt volumes of current errors; but alſo to correct in time thoſe few errors which may ſlide into works more pregnant with merit and truth, before they have gained eſtabliſhment from authority: the former of theſe two objects will occur oftneſt in my *Reſearches*, the latter will form chiefly the contents of my preſent

preſent *doubts* concerning this learned and valuable illuſtration of Iſaiah. Our propoſed examination indeed of theſe notes on the prophecies of Iſaiah, as well as alſo my foregoing *Remarks* on Mr. Richardſon's miſtakes concerning the hiſtories of Ezra and Nehemiah, are properly a part of that ultimate object propoſed by my *Reſearches* concerning chronology; and therefore ought not in point of right order to have been brought forward until I arrived at the ages in queſtion in the due courſe of my *Reſearches*, one being long before our foundation date, and the other after it; but the publication of theſe two late works tempted me to anticipate theſe ſubjects before their Time: if therefore I have or ſhall make uſe of hiſtoric facts or dates, which ſhall not ſeem to be ſufficiently proved, they will depend for farther proof upon my *Reſearches* concerning thoſe ages; and it is the juſt application of them in order to explain the words of thoſe ſacred writers which does alone come under our conſideration at preſent.

But in order that theſe anticipated ſubjects or any of thoſe intermediate ones, which are neceſſary links in the courſe of our *Reſearches* may not interrupt or delay

too

too long our chain of reaſoning there, I have therefore contrived to carry on two volumes together; that while the *Reſearches* are advancing in one, I may collect into the other, in the form of ſeparate Diſſertations, all ſuch intermediate ſubjects as thus ſhall ſerve to elucidate and confirm any poſitions advanced there without proof; or elſe that, when I have given there two or three ſufficient proofs, I may reſerve for this collective volume all leſs direct and more doubtful ones, which, however, by explaining paſſages in various books may contribute to throw light on other authors and ſubjects, beſides that for which they are more particularly adduced.

The prophetic books of the Jewiſh Scriptures as well as the hiſtoric, contain a very curious field for enquiry to an Hiſtorian, Chronologer and Antiquary, independently of their importance to a Chriſtian; becauſe accounts are interſperſed there relative to events, manners, nations and ages, concerning which very few anecdotes have been preſerved in prophane hiſtories: and as the uſefulneſs of theſe books to a Chriſtian will be improved and ſtrengthened by the juſt critical enquiries of the other three claſſes of readers, the latter therefore become

come the firſt object of examination, although the Chriſtian uſe is the firſt in point of importance. Moreover, the enquiries of the Hiſtorian, Chronologer and Antiquary are not only the firſt in order, but alſo the moſt extenſive in their application; becauſe thoſe facts and dates in the Jewiſh Prophecies, which ſhall by ſuch critical enquiries be well eſtabliſhed as certain, will become equally concluſive among free thinkers as among Chriſtians: for while the Chriſtian juſtly claims credit to the certainty of events related in the Jewiſh prophecies from this circumſtance, namely, becauſe they had been predicted by divine inſpiration before they took place; ſo when the free thinker becomes compelled by critical enquiries to acknowledge and believe the certainty of the facts related there, although indeed for different reaſons from the Chriſtian, he becomes obliged in conſequence to have recourſe to the perverſe and prepoſterous ſuppoſition, that the events muſt have really happened before the prophecies were put together*: but then this very ſuppoſition

* "The author of the book of Daniel appears plainly, from the laſt chapter of his book, to be a writer of things paſt, after a prophetical manner, and to have lived after divers of the events that he ſeems

to

at the ſame time affords an argument alſo in favor of the authenticity of the prophetic books themſelves; for it proves, that they muſt at lateſt have been compiled very ſoon after the events took place, while they were yet freſh in the memories of men, and before there was opportunity for their being corrupted by tradition. Thus then the authenticity of ſuch ſcriptural facts and dates, as ſhall be well eſtabliſhed by critical enquiry, neceſſarily draws after it an acknowledgment even from free thinkers themſelves of the antiquity and authenticity of the contents of the prophetic books; and their denial of the reality of the prophecies has no other effect than to ſubſtitute good human teſtimony for the events in queſtion inſtead of that which is divine. It is in this ſenſe then and under this diſ-

to prophecy of; which was a method of writing uſed both among the Jews and Chriſtians as well as Pagans (ſee 2d b. of Eſdras in Apocr.) but though the book of Daniel be wrote after ſuch events as ſeem *clearly* referred to therein; yet, like the Jewiſh hiſtorical books, it ſets forth facts very imperfectly, and often contrary to other hiſtorical relations." *Collin's Scheme of literal Prophecy*, p. 155. Now if it ſhall appear by our critical enquiries, that neither the Jewiſh hiſtorical nor yet prophetic books do in reality ſet forth facts contrary to other hiſtoric relations, then they become ſtill more authentic regiſters of antient events.

tinction

tinction that I refer for the truth of facts to the contents of the prophetic books, equally with reſpect to the free thinker as Chriſtian, namely, from a conviction that among Chriſtian readers the credit of thoſe contents is ſupported by a belief of divine inſpiration; and alſo, that even among the free thinking claſs it is ſtill ſupportable by good human teſtimony; my concluſions therefore will apply equally to both claſſes of readers. As to any proofs, which may be drawn from the prophetic books in favor of Chriſtian revelation, to aſcertain theſe is foreign to my *Doubts*; which will be confined ſolely to illuſtrate the facts themſelves and the meaning of the writer, with the concomitant circumſtances of time and place and other ſimilar particulars: when theſe ſhall be once rightly eſtabliſhed, they become principles of reaſoning common to all parties, and an equal right will ſtill remain for each to draw what inferences they think themſelves able to maintain, conſiſtently with a good conſcience at the bar of Reaſon and Judgment.

The learned Tranſlator of Iſaiah introduces his notes by giving a brief ſummary of the hiſtory of thoſe times; in the concluſion of which he has theſe words: " In

the 4th year of his reign, Shalmaneſer king of Aſſyria invaded the kingdom of Iſrael, took Samaria, and carried away the Iſraelites into captivity; and replaced them by a different people ſent from his own country." Now there is great reaſon to doubt the truth of the fact here aſſerted, that it was Shalmaneſer *who replaced the Iſraelites by a different people*; for it was in reality Eſarhaddon the 2d king after Shalmaneſer. Joſephus indeed on the ſtrength of an ambiguous paſſage in 2 Kings attributed this act to Shalmaneſer*, but Uſher and Prideaux, after other modern critics, have corrected his error on the evidence of a leſs ambiguous paſſage in ſcripture†; one would have wiſhed therefore not to have ſeen this exploded error revived again upon the credit of ſuch an authority as the tranſlator, unleſs he had ſubjoined ſome good reaſons to ſupport it. The words in 2 K. "And the king of Aſſyria brought men from Babylon" are indeed ſo wanting in preciſion, that they may appear to refer to

* Antiq. 9. 14.---"And the king of Aſſyria brought men from Babylon," &c. 2 Kings xvii. 24.

† "We do ſacrifice unto your God, ſince the days of Eſarhaddon king of Aſſur, who brought us up hither." *Ezra* iv. 2.

the

the before mentioned king Shalmaneſer, the *ſame* who carried the Iſraelites away; but they may alſo refer to a *later* king; accordingly in Ezra we are informed by the very deſcendents of thoſe *men from Babylon*, that it was the later king Eſarhaddon, who brought them into Samaria: and this ſeems to be confirmed alſo by Iſaiah, who, as we ſhall find reaſon to think, prophecies of this very event in ch. xiv. ver. 1 and 2, a prophecy, like many others in Iſaiah, erroneouſly ſuppoſed by the tranſlator and other moderns to refer to a much later event, the return of the Jews from Babylon after the 70 years captivity. But however this may be, I doubt ſtill farther whether the Tranſlator has not himſelf in another place contradicted this his own account: for in his note to chapter 7, 8, he ſays, "That it was Eſarhaddon *who* carried away the remains of the 10 tribes, which had been left by Tiglath-Pileſer and Shalmaneſer, and *who* planted the country with new inhabitants." Either this is a contradiction to the former account, or Samaria was planted with new inhabitants by *both* kings, which being a ſingular opinion ſtands in need of confirmation; others indeed have ſuppoſed (and only ſuppoſed without

proof) that Iſraelites were *carried away* by both kings, but I know of none who has ever before ſuppoſed that Babylonians were *brought* to Samaria by both*.

The Tranſlator ſays farther, "That Hezekiah was not deterred by this alarming example from refuſing to pay the tribute to the king of Aſſyria, which had been impoſed on Ahaz." Now I doubt that this account attributes to Hezekiah a raſhneſs and want of political diſcretion, for which there is no ſufficient evidence in ſcripture: on the contrary ſcripture expreſsly places this rebellion of Hezekiah *before* that alarming example of the total deſtruction of the kingdom of Iſrael, and not after it. The only place (I think) where it is mentioned is in 2 Kings, chapter xviii. 7. where we read, "that Hezekiah rebelled againſt the king of Aſſyria, and ſerved him not;" and

* Patrick indeed aſſerts this in his note to Ezra iv. 2. "Eſarhaddon brought a ſecond colony after that brought by Salmanaſſer:" but he gives no proof of it, and directly contradicts it in two other places, as in note to 2 Kings xvii. 24. "This was not done by Salmanaſſer, but by his ſon Eſarhaddon, *v.* Ezra iv. 2." Again in note to 2 Kings xix. 37. "Eſarhaddon was the king that ſent a colony to people Samaria, as I obſerved before from Ezra iv. 2." So that his firſt aſſertion ſeems to have been made by miſtake only.

this

this account is intermixed with the relation of other actions of Hezekiah, which all ſeem to have been *previous* to the expedition of Shalmaneſer againſt Samaria; for this expedition is not related until two verſes afterward, and was not until the 4th of Hezekiah. A few verſes after this laſt event occurs the relation of Senacherib's attack upon Hezekiah in his 14th year; where, again, on the contrary he confeſſes, "That he has offended; return from me, that which thou putteſt on me I will bear;" but in this recantation no mention is made that the offence was begun *ſince* the deſtruction of Samaria by Shalmaneſer and not before. And beſides the above direct teſtimony in 2 Kings, other particulars alſo confirm that it was begun *before*: for we find that Hoſea the king of Iſrael, whom Shalmaneſer attacked, had entered into conſpiracy with So king of Egypt*; therefore it is probable that there was *before* the 4th of Hez. a confederacy of ſeveral States in Paleſtine ſupported by the king of Egypt to refuſe obedience to the Aſſyrians; into which Heze-

* "The king of Aſſyria found conſpiracy in Hoſhea: for he had ſent meſſengers to So king of Egypt and brought no preſent to the king of Aſſyria, &c." 2 *Chr.* xvii. 4.

kiah

kiah might perhaps have entered, or at leaſt have taken advantage of this confederacy to refuſe the uſual tribute, and more conſiſtently with his wonted political prudence, than he could afterwards have rebelled ſolely by himſelf. It ſhould ſeem, that the city of Tyre alſo had entered into this confederacy; for Shalmaneſer, immediately after the deſtruction of Samaria, attacked the Tyrians*, a better and nearer morſel for a conqueror than Jeruſalem in the mountains; but the war being protracted above 5 years, Shalmaneſer died, and thus Hezekiah eſcaped his puniſhment until the expedition of the ſucceſſor Senacherib; which we find to have been equally levelled againſt Egypt as Paleſtine, and thus all the members of the confederacy felt the effects of it in their turn. This laid the foundation for that future enmity between the Aſſyrian empire and Egyptians, which ended at laſt in the deſtruction of the kingdom of Egypt; whoſe policy had ever remained the ſame, that of drawing the ſeveral ſtates of Paleſtine into a league againſt the Aſſyrians in order to form out of thoſe ſtates a barrier in favour

* *Joſephus* Antiq. 9. 14.

of

of Egypt; and while it thus oſtenſibly held out offers of aſſiſtance to ſupport them, in reality it only ſought at their expence to keep danger at a greater diſtance from itſelf. It was to this deceitful policy of Egypt, though in later times, that Ezechiel alludes, when he denounces woe againſt it, "becauſe it had been a ſtaff of reed to the houſe of Iſrael*:" and that Egypt had played the ſame game in regard to Hezekiah is expreſſly aſſerted by Rabſhakeh in his ſpeech to this king in Iſaiah, to which ſpeech Ezechiel above ſeems to refer. Rabſhakeh ſaith, "What is this confidence, wherein thou truſteſt, that thou rebelleſt againſt me? Lo, thou truſteſt in the ſtaff of this broken reed, on Egypt, whereon if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce it; ſo is Pharoah king of Egypt to all that truſt in him;" (36. 4.) not meaning to deſcribe the deceitful conduct of that particular king of Egypt on the throne, but the general policy of them all towards the inhabitants of Paleſtine. This connection of Egypt with ſome of the chiefs of Jeruſalem, if not with Hezekiah, is alſo confeſſed by Iſaiah†.

* 29. 6.

† Chap. xxx. & xxxi. in ver. 1. inſtead of "who cover with a covering," the tranſlator renders it, "who ratify convenants," viz. with the Egyptians.

Have

Have we then any reaſon to preſume, that theſe covenants were only of later date than the 6th of Hezekiah, in which the kingdom of Samaria was deſtroyed, tho' before his 14th? or ſhall we not rather conclude that Hezekiah had entered into the confederacy with Egypt and Samaria as early as his acceſſion, and at the time when he is actually ſaid to have rebelled againſt Aſſyria? That it was thus, ſeems confirmed ſtill farther by the friendly intercourſe, which at the acceſſion of Hezekiah ſubſiſted between the kingdoms of Judah and Iſrael, inſtead of their late enmity: for we read in 2 Chronicles, that Hezekiah in his firſt year ſent through all the tribes of Iſrael to come to the Paſſover, which he celebrated at Jeruſalem, (30. 1.) and that many of them came; (ver. 11 and 18.) alſo, that after the Paſſover the worſhippers proceeded not only through Judah but alſo through the two chief tribes of Iſrael, Ephraim and Manaſſeh, and brake down the Idols and Groves (31. 1.) Moreover Pekah, the chief enemy of Judah, being ſlain by the preſent king Hoſhea, before the acceſſion of Hezekiah, and the kingdom of Syria being alſo deſtroyed by the Aſſyrian king, both theſe events would naturally unite

unite again the kingdoms of Iſrael and Judah, to both of whom the Aſſyrian king muſt have now appeared a common and dangerous enemy; for in the reign of Pekah Tiglah Pileſer had taken away many cities from Iſrael (2 Kings xv. 29.) and ſince the acceſſion of Hoſea Shalmaneſer had come againſt him and exacted tribute (xvii. 3.): neither had even Ahaz king of Iſrael eſcaped; for Tiglah Pileſer, though ſent for by him as a friend, had exacted great preſents from him, "and diſtreſſed him, but helped him not." (2 Chron. xxviii. 20.) Theſe events therefore would naturally unite both kingdoms in a common league with the king of Egypt and others againſt the Aſſyrians. So that every light afforded by ſcripture as well as elſewhere confirms, that the rebellion of Hezekiah *preceded* the deſtruction of Samaria, and I know of nothing to countenance the ſuggeſtion of the tranſlator of its being *ſubſequent* to that *alarming example*, except the ſingle authority of Prideaux*. This true account does indeed ſtill ſhew, that Hezekiah was duped by the king of Egypt in common with many of his neighbors; but that has been

* Uſher leaves it undetermined at what time Hezekiah rebelled, and the commentators likewiſe. Jackſon rightly underſtands it to have been at the acceſſion of Hezekiah. *Vol.* I. p. 317.

the ſate of many a ſhrewd man, and is an objection to his political diſcretion of no account in compariſon of the raſhneſs aſcribed to him by the tranſlator, in rebelling ſingly and unſupported notwithſtanding the fatal cataſtrophe to Samaria; a raſhneſs neither juſtifiable by his religious faith any more than reconcileable to hiſtory and human prudence: ſince all the prophecies until that time and under Ahaz iſſued by Iſaiah, contained denunciations of the greateſt calamities to Judah from the kings of Aſſyria, (chap. vii. and viii.) and that notwithſtanding its late puniſhment by civil wars between Judah and Iſrael, "God's wrath was not turned away but ſtretched out ſtill." (ix. 21.) Prideaux therefore has done great injuſtice to the character of Hezekiah, while he has thus induſtriouſly ſought to repreſent him to be confident beyond what is written of him, as well as required from him; by making him ruſh into needleſs danger in order to exaggerate his reliance on the Lord, in contradiction to the hiſtoric teſtimony of ſcripture and all ſober political diſcretion, and in defiance alſo of the moſt early prophecies of Iſaiah, not contradicted until after the invaſion had begun; for until then Iſaiah had held out no other comfort to Hezekiah than that of a remnant being left, after deſtruction of the reſt.

The Title to Iſaiah, writ by the Prophet himſelf.

THE Tranſlator ſays, in his notes to Ch. I. "Vitringa has very judiciouſly *ſuppoſed*, that the former part of the title was *originally* prefixed to the ſingle prophecy [contained in this Chapter] and that when the *collection* of all Iſaiah's prophecies was made, the enumeration of the kings of Judah was *added*, to make it at the ſame time a proper title to the whole book." Now I doubt, whether commentators have not been too laviſh in *ſuppoſing* without ſufficient grounds, that additions and interpolations have been made in the Scriptural books, from time to time, in later ages, by editors or collectors: and particularly with reſpect to the prophetic books, altho' all their titles expreſſly informs us, that both the title and body are the works of thoſe prophets themſelves, whoſe names they bear; yet Vitringa is here commended as judicious for not believing them, and for rather *ſuppoſing* both that the title is in part an interpolation, and alſo that the body of the prophecies themſelves were not put together in their preſent form by Iſaiah himſelf, but only a *collection* of them made by ſome later unknown hand, in

ſome unknown age. Although ſuch a manufacture of the ſcriptural books by various hands may not indeed deſtroy, yet doubtleſs it will contribute to diminiſh the credit and authenticity of them in the eyes of captious, if not of critical readers likewiſe; and will at leaſt render it difficult to diſtinguiſh between the original words of the prophet, and thoſe of the collector and interpolator. Moreover, the firſt and moſt natural preſumption with reſpect to a ſacred Author as well as any profane one, is, that the work, which bears his name, is both compoſed and arranged by himſelf; and critical inquiries ought firſt to point out unanſwerable objections to that preſumption, before the contrary can be reaſonably admitted. But where have any ſuch critical objections been hitherto preſented to the public with reſpect to the Jewiſh prophets? In truth I know of none: A haſty *opinion* only ſeems to have been taken up by ſome, and too readily adopted by all others, that the prophecies are put together without any regard to *order*; hence it has been as haſtily concluded, that they were not put together by the authors themſelves, but *collected* by ſome later hands; and hence again it has been as haſtily admitted, that a collector of the body of the work might eaſily become an interpolator in the title

and

and elſewhere, in order, as the tranſlator ſays "to *make* it a proper title to the whole book." Such ſevere accuſations againſt the originality of the prophetic books ought to be built upon ſome ſolid foundation: yet I doubt again whether the whole be not founded upon mere miſtake and wanton not *judicious ſuppoſition*; for neither does the fact appear evident that the Prophecies are in reality put together in *diſorder*, but rather with plain marks of ſuch oratorical order and ſkill, as might be expected in artleſs ages, and alſo with ſome viſible marks of human diſcretion in the prediction of things unſeen; neither in conſequence ought it to be concluded, that theſe prophecies were only *collected* at random afterwards, and not arranged in their preſent form by the authors themſelves; neither in courſe will there any longer appear convenient opportunities, where a collector may be ſuppoſed to ſlide into an interpolator, whenever a commentator ſhall think fit to make the *ſuppoſition*. We know the uſe which *Simon* contrived, and other Papiſts have and would wiſh to make of this ſuppoſition of frequent collections, additions and interpolations, being made by others in regard to the Scriptural books, which is, to prove, that Proteſtants muſt themſelves

have recourſe to eccleſiaſtic tradition for the authenticity of thoſe very books of Scripture, which they eſteem their rule of faith. It was with that view, that Simon deſcants ſo much in this ſtrain, which Vitringa approves, "Les propheties n'ont pas été tout-à-fait compoſées par les prophetes de la maniere qu'elles ſont preſentment; mais ceux, qui les ont recueillies, y ont inſeré d'autres actes à l'occaſion de quelques hiſtoires, qui pouvoient ſervir à l'éclairciſſement de ces Propheties. à quoi l'on doit ajouter ce qui eſt à la *tete* de chaque prophetie, &c. *Hiſt. Crit. c.* 6." The purpoſes theſe aſſertions are deſtined to ſerve, is thus pointed out in his preface. "Les grands changemens, qui ſont ſurvenus aux exemplaires de la Bible ruinent entierement le principe des Proteſtans, qui ne conſultent que les meſmes exemplaires de la maniere qu'ils ſont aujourd'hui, &c." But whatever may be the truth with reſpect to the other ſcriptural books, yet in regard to the prophetic ones it is a ſubject not hitherto ſufficiently examined, although indeed one on which the above judgment has been approved by candid and learned Proteſtants. Let us therefore now endeavour to inveſtigate the truth at the bar of criticiſm; and the rather, becauſe it will be

be neceſſary firſt of all to ſtate the true nature of the argumentative order, which prevails in the patriotic viſion of each prophet, before we can form any juſt concluſion concerning the chronologic order of the events referred to in Iſaiah or any other.

The Hebrew word, rendered *viſion* by the tranſlator, is indeed in the ſingular number; yet Le Clerc has thought proper to turn it into the plural, *viſions*, under a like pretence as with the tranſlator, that hereby it would be *made* "a more fit title to the whole book, which contains many viſions:*" but this is a very inſufficient reaſon; for in like manner Hoſea and Micah intitle the whole book of their prophecies in the ſingular "The word of the Lord that came unto me, &c." although by the concluſion of the title it appears, that the divine *word* came to them at different times, in three or four different reigns. As Vitringa had no better reaſon than by *viſion* being ſingular for *ſuppoſing* this title "The viſion of Iſaiah" to have been *originally* prefixed to the *ſingle* prophecy in the firſt chapter, one can diſcover here no claim he has to the appellation of judicious. It might with more propriety be preſumed

* Vertimus plurali *Viſa*, quia hæc inſcriptio eſt totius libri, qui multa Viſa complectitur. *Not. in Iſaiam.*

to

(if it be not a ſubject too weak to bear an argument) that Iſaiah intitled his whole work, *a viſion* in the ſingular, becauſe he had ſo arranged and connected the ſeveral prophecies together, that they formed but one whole work of religious and patriotic exhortation, though conſiſting of various coherent parts; juſt as Homer and Virgil formed each but one Epic Poem out of various connected epiſodes. This preſumption, however, ariſing from the title, will be found ſo confirmed by the connexion throughout the body of the work, that we ſhall be able to diſcover no good reaſon for ſuppoſing again with Vitringa, that this was collected at random by others, and not put together in its preſent form by the prophet himſelf, whoſe name it bears; ſince the author will appear to have had in view before him a very conſiſtent plan and coherent method in the arrangement of the ſeveral parts.

That this title "The Viſion of Iſaiah" is at leaſt both ancient and alſo quoted in Scripture as the title to the whole book, is juſtly confirmed by Tremellius and the tranſlator from 2 Chr. xxxii, 32; where the writer refers his readers for a farther account of the acts of Hezekiah to the *Viſion of Iſaiah*; but theſe acts

are

are interſperſed through the book, not reſtrained to the firſt prophecy: moreover, neither Jerome among the ancients, nor Tremellius, Huetius, or Lowth among the moderns, ſeem to have entertained any ſuch doubt as Vitringa and the tranſlator concerning the originality of the title; on the contrary, Tremellius and Huetius expreſſly aſcribe the whole of it to Iſaiah himſelf *. Le Clerc alſo ſays nothing to the contrary; yet perhaps he might entertain ſome doubt about it, ſince he ſeems to doubt concerning the title to Jeremiah †, concerning which there is much leſs room for doubt; for both in Jeremiah and Ezechiel the titles ſpeak of thoſe prophets in the firſt perſon; whereby they evidently claim the prophets for their authors. Ezechiel ſays, "It came

* Continetur verſu primo libri totius inſcriptio—auctor ſeu potius *ſcriptor* Iſaias. *Tremell: not.* 1.

Viſa, quæ toto opere narrantur 4 regnis *ſibi* oblata fuiſſe *ſcribit* Iſaias. *Dem. Evang. prop.* 4. *de Iſaia. ſ.* 3.

† Jeremias, vel qui hanc inſcriptionem vaticiniis ejus prefixit, ſignificat, &c. Le Clerc at writing this, in 1710, ſeems to have forgot what he had ſaid in his *Sentimens ſur l'Hiſtoire* of Simon, in 1685, "Les auteurs de ce Livre [Nehemiah] parlant à la premiere perſonne, on ne peut pas douter, que ce ne ſoient des gens, qui ont vécu à Jeruſalem dans le même temps que les choſes qu'ils racontent ſe ſont paſſées. *Lettr.* 8.

to

to paſs in the 30th year, as *I* was among the captives—*I* ſaw viſions—the word of the Lord came unto *me*—and *I* looked." In Jeremiah we read in like manner "The words of Jeremiah to whom the word of the Lord came in the days of Joſiah, &c.—then the word of the Lord came unto *me*." Can criticiſm ſuggeſt here the leaſt reaſonable doubt, that the prophets were not themſelves the writers of theſe introductions as well as of the body of the work? If it be objected, that the Hebrew pronoun tranſlated *him* is often corrupted into *me*; yet this cannot be the caſe here, becauſe it is added, "Then ſaid *I*, ah Lord, behold *I* cannot ſpeak.—But the Lord ſaid unto *me*, &c." The ambiguity of the Hebrew is alſo to be much lamented, but this want of preciſion equally weakens the attacks of hypercriticiſm as the defences raiſed againſt it. And ſtill farther the titles to both theſe Prophets, as well as to Amos are ſo interwoven with the ſubſequent contents, as to carry with them every appearance of originality: ſince then by theſe examples we find ſimilar introductions to have been ſuitable to the manner and practice of that age and that claſs of writers; analogy demands, that we allow the like originality to

the

the titles of Iſaiah and other prophets, which contain no ſuch ſpecific evidence either way.

In fine, this *ſuppoſition* in Vitringa of a want of originality in the title to Iſaiah is only a ſmall ſhoot from that main root of error, the *ſuppoſition* of a total want of *order* in the body of the work; it being eaſily conceived, that they who could tack together the latter without method, might as eaſily patch up the former without propriety, the office of an interpolator being but a ſmall remove from that of a collector: let us therefore next examine whether there be any better foundation for this latter accuſation.

The Prophecies of Ezechiel, Jeremiah, Iſaiah, and others, arranged agreeably to the Order of hiſtoric Accompliſhment, or oratorical Argumentation, whenever they depart from the Order of Delivery.

WITH whom the ſuppoſition of diſorderly arrangement in all the books of prophecy originated, whether among the commentators or free-thinkers, I cannot pretend to determine; it was, however, very early and greedily ſwallowed by

both; by the latter as matter of objection to the ſcriptures *, by the former through want of attention: and from the time of Jerome and of Tremellius, down to that of the tranſlator, ſo univerſally has this fact been taken for granted, that no one has ſo much as thought it neceſſary to produce proofs of the fact, or even to examine the truth of it; no, not Huetius himſelf, who is in all other reſpects a ſtrenuous advocate for the authenticity of the ſcriptures †. If

* Philoſophus Theologico-Politicus libri hujus auctoritatem elevat hoc argumento, quod non is ipſe ſit Liber, quem Vaticinia ſua conjecit Iſaias, ſed tantum compilatio fragmentorum libri hujus, quæ ut fors tulit hinc inde collecta, potiſſimum vero ex Chronicis regum Juda et Iſrael, et in hoc quod habemus volumen compacta ſunt; atque id vult adverſus reliquos prophetarum libros valere. Rationes cur ita ſentiat has habet, quod diſturbato ordine ac perverſo digeſtæ ſint Iſaiæ prophetiæ, nec eam tueantur ſeriem, qua primum ab auctore inter ſe collocatæ ſunt; quod certum ſit preterea, ex rabbinorum ſententia ſub Manaſſe quoque Iſaiam Vaticinia edidiſſe, quorum in ipſius libro reperire liceat omnino nullum. Verum hæc facile diſſolvimus: nam quoad confuſum ordinem, vel inde maxime appareat non eſſe id humanæ mentis opus, res conſertè contextè que explicantis, et rationum cohærentiam ſequentis, ſed afflatu potius cæleſti inſtinctæ et agitatæ, ac res futuras per interciſa et ſalebroſa pandentis oracula, quorum obſcuritas per ipſos demum eventus rerum erat illuſtranda. *Huet. de Iſaia.*

† In Prophetis, maximeque in Ezechiele et Jeremia nequa-

the ſubjoined anſwers of Huetius and Le Clerc to the objection of pretended diſorder in the prophecies were ſufficient, namely, to this purport, that *Spiritus propheticus non eſt ſpiritus chronologicus*, there would be an end at once of all proof from the apparent diſorder in the prophecies that they could not have been put together by the prophets themſelves; for according to the tenor of

nequaquam regum et temporum ordo ſervetur, ſed præpoſtere, quod juxta hiſtoriam poſtea factum ſit, prius referri, et quod prius geſtum ſit, poſtea; aliud enim eſt hiſtoriam, aliud prophetiam ſcribere. *Hieronym. not. in Jerem. c.* 21.

Ad ordinem quod attinet, certum eſt neque Prophetas, neque Sacerdotes (per quos Prophetiæ in ſacrarium relatæ ſunt) ſemper habuiſſe temporum rationem. *Trem. not.* 1.—Grotius hæc ad tempora, quæ Maccabaicis ſucceſſerunt refert quaſi Propheta in ſuis vaticiniis temporum rationem haberet: ſed ſpiritus propheticus non eſt, ut ſic loquar, ſpiritus Chronologicus. *Le Clerc, not.* 4. *Cap* 66. *Iſaiæ.*

Nec enim ſemper temporis ordini congruit ratio vaticiniorum, in quibus *ὕστερον πρότερον* ſæpe occurrit. *Huetius. Dem. Evang.* prop. 4. *de Iſaia, ſect.* 3.

The ſixth chapter is by moſt interpreters thought to be the firſt *in order* of his prophecies: but this perhaps may not be ſo; for Iſaiah is ſaid in the general title of his prophecies, to have prophecied in the time of Uzziah—not that Iſaiah's prophecies are placed in *exact order of time:* chapters 2. 3. 4. 5. ſeem by internal marks to be antecedent to chapter 1. *Tranſlator in note* 1. *to ch.* 6.

theſe anſwers, no order of any kind ought to be expected from prophets, in regard to what is delivered by divine inſpiration; but the real truth is, that this anſwer will not ſtill excuſe the prophets for neglecting to mark the right order of time, in which the ſeveral prophetic truths were *communicated* to them, this order of compilation being a matter ſubject to the guidance of mere human diſcretion, and in which divine inſpiration could no way be expected to interfere; ſo that theſe anſwers are by no means ſufficient to remove the objection drawn from diſorderly arrangement; but the inſolidity of it will appear from the following conſiderations, viz. It ought to be firſt determined what kind of order that is in the arrangement of prophecies, which reaſon can beſt claim and expect. Now, excepting Jerome, not one of the interpreters, down to the tranſlator, ſeem to have had the leaſt idea of the poſſibility of any better and more reaſonable order of arrangement, than that of the *chronologic order* in which the prophecies were *delivered*; but this is by no means true, for there are at leaſt two other kinds of order, and both preferable, viz. that of the *hiſtoric order* in which the prophecies were *accompliſhed*, and alſo that *oratorical order* which

which might be thought beſt ſuited to the purpoſe of *perſuaſion and argumentation*. Jerome indeed himſelf, in the paſſage already referred to, only tells us ambiguouſly, like Huetius, *aliud eſt hiſtoriam, aliud prophetiam ſcribere*; but in another place he comes more home to the point in queſtion, when he ſays, "Non curæ erat prophetis tempora ſervare, quæ hiſtoriæ leges deſiderant; ſed ſcribere ut cunque audientibus atque lecturis *utile* noverant." *Not. Jerom. c.* 25. Here we ſee he hits upon the right anſwer to the objection, by ſuggeſting whether there may not be a more *uſeful* method of arrangement for readers and hearers, than a chronologic order: certainly there may; but he ought to have gone ſtill farther, and pointed out of what nature that better order is, and whether the prophets had or had not actually embraced this more *uſeful* one: this, however, will appear to be the real fact, if we can ſhew that in reality they never do depart from the chronologic order of *delivery*, unleſs when they ſubſtitute a better order of arrangement, namely, either the order of *hiſtoric accompliſhment*, or the ſtill better order of oratorical and perſuaſive *argumentation*. Almoſt every ſpecies of compoſition has a peculiar order of arrangement

ment either proper to it, or preferable to any other: the chronologic order of *annals* gives place in *Hiſtory* to the more uſeful method of arranging events immediately ſubſequent to thoſe motives and cauſes, of which they are the natural and probable effects; whereby general maxims of human policy are illuſtrated, being either confirmed or contradicted by particular examples: *Epic poetry* plunges at the very firſt into the midſt of things, and prefers to begin near the concluſion, recapitulating by degrees all the leſſer preceding events, which led to that more important event, the concluding one: *Oratory* alſo has its proper order of arrangement, and becomes more forcible and perſuaſive by diſtributing the *narration* of events, the *proofs* and other conſtituent parts in ſome one method preferably to any other: why then ſhould it be ſuppoſed that *prophetic oratory*, as well as civil, (in order to impreſs more forcibly, thoſe religious and political truths it aims to propagate) ſhould not claim a like privilege of being exempt from the beaten track and vulgar round of mere order of time, but ſhould be tyed down in arrangement by the real ſucceſſion of events and the conſtraints of chronology? The ſuppoſition is ſo plainly unreaſeaſonable,

ſonable, and the ſuggeſtion in Jerome of a more *uſeful* order ſo plauſible, that it only remains to examine (what Jerome did not accompliſh) the true ſtate of the facts, and whether one or other of the above-mentioned ſpecies of order and principles of juſtification may not be found applicable to every book of prophecy, and to every example therein, concerning which any complaint of diſorder has been hitherto made; at leaſt ſufficiently to prove, that in ſome caſes the narration of prophecies is even artfully and rhetorically arranged; in other caſes ſuch a degree of art is viſible, as ſeems ſuitable to the ſmall improvements of thoſe early times; and that in no inſtances do there appear ſuch a total diſorder and want of connexion, as might be expected, if they had been only collected together into books and arranged promiſcuouſly, like the books of Odes in Horace, without any conſiſtent view and preconceived plan of orderly diſtribution. If then any ſuch conſiſtent plan ſhall be diſcovered, it muſt be prepoſterous to fly again to a farther ſuppoſition, that this plan was rather introduced by ſome unknown collector than by each prophet himſelf, whoſe name is prefixed to his own work; it will rather juſtify Iſaiah

and

and the reſt for calling each of their works in the ſingular, *a Viſion*, tho' compoſed of many parts, each being formed into one continued exhortatory oration after the prophetic mode of the age and connected throughout; not indeed with all the rhetorical artifice of a Cicero or Iſocrates, yet with ſuch ſtrains of argumentation as well as eloquence as might be expected in an artleſs age; and at leaſt with a ſufficiency of both to prove, that neither was Iſocrates the firſt compoſer of written orations, neither can fair criticiſm produce any adequate reaſons to conclude, that thoſe prophetic books, thus arranged on conſiſtent plans, were put together in their preſent forms by any perſons different from the prophets themſelves.

It may, however, with truth be allowed, that the chronologic order of time, in which prophecies are conceived and *delivered*, is at leaſt a natural method of arrangement, the moſt ſimple alſo of any, perhaps the moſt obvious, and ſuch as both a reader might be *firſt* apt to claim, and alſo a writer be now firſt apt to adopt; but it muſt at the ſame time be allowed likewiſe, that farther reflection will ſhew this to be the moſt rude and inartificial ſpecies of order in a com-

compiler, as well as the leaſt *uſeful* one to a reader: it is indeed a matter almoſt of perfect indifference to a reader to know the order in which prophecies were delivered, unleſs the order of *delivery* were always conformable to the hiſtoric order, in which they were afterwards *accompliſhed*; which they neither are, nor can perhaps be expected to be, becauſe ſupernatural agencies concerning future events no man can pretend to confine to the method commonly obſerved in relation to human actions paſt.

It is then only in this ſenſe, (if in any) in which the aſſertion of Le Clerc is true, "That ſpiritus propheticus non eſt ſpiritus chronologicus," that is, it is not to be expected, from divine inſpiration, that it ſhould ſuggeſt the prophecies of future events exactly in that *hiſtoric* order in which they are to be accompliſhed, But if this had been effected, it would have formed a *ſecond* order of arrangement, and a much more *uſeful* one, than the *firſt* abovementioned: it would become thus ſuperior in point of utility and inſtruction; becauſe, if it had obtained uniformly throughout, we ſhould have been always able to know the order of hiſtoric accompliſhment from the order of delivery, and conſequently ſhould

have been able to determine in every example, as to what prophecies were accompliſhed by what events; of which we are at preſent often ignorant, and even for ſuch information as we have concerning this, we are obliged to call in the aſſiſtance of profane hiſtory, yet even then are ſtill often ſubject to many doubts. Without ſuch an union then in prophecies between the order of *delivery* and the order of *accompliſhment*, the *firſt* of theſe two by itſelf is in fact perfectly ſimilar to that firſt rude order obſerved in a merchant's day-book; wherein a hundred different ſpecies of goods are regiſtered each day as ſold to a hundred different perſons, but entered promiſcuouſly without the leaſt other order than merely that chronologic one ariſing from the days of the month on which they were ſold: afterwards, however, the merchant places them in another and better order, in other books of accounts, namely, either according to the *ſpecies* of goods ſold, or the *perſons* to whom ſold. In like manner an hiſtorian receives the chronologic order of events, from the rude hands of the annaliſt; but afterwards he diſpoſes his materials in a more inſtructive manner, by ſubjoining events after their reſpective motives, and concluding

ing

ing his relation of both with general deductions for political uſe concerning the common courſe of things in ſimilar caſes. Why then ſhould a compiler of prophecies be alone ſuppoſed to have never made uſe of this common advantage of improving upon his own originally rude materials, by moulding theſe alſo at his leiſure afterwards, into ſome better form for public inſtruction, than that leſs intereſting order in which he firſt conceived and delivered them? Now *one* way of effecting ſuch improvement (altho' but in part) will be, if a prophet ſhall have ſo far deviated from the *firſt* order of delivery, as to arrange his prophecies agreeably to this *ſecond* order of accompliſhment in all, or at leaſt in ſome of thoſe caſes, wherein his prophecies were accompliſhed during his own life, and before he had put a finiſhing hand to the compilation of his prophetic book of exhortation: by ſuch means he would be enabled to introduce this *ſecond* and more inſtructive order of *hiſtoric* arrangement, ſo far as was within his power, that is, in regard to all ſuch prophecies as might be accompliſhed before his death, or at leaſt in ſome of the moſt important inſtances *; whereby he would at-

* Jerome, amidſt a profuſion of traſh, does ſometimes interſperſe judicious remarks, as for inſtance, whe

tain, in ſome degree, to that advantage of an union between the *ſpiritus propheticus & chronologicus*, which was before wanting, and which would ſtill be ſo far wanting, that the dates of the order of *delivery* muſt be often deranged, in order to follow the order of *hiſtoric accompliſhment*. This method of improvement is moreover in the prophetic books imperfect alſo in the following reſpects; for it has not been introduced, perhaps, in all caſes, where it might; therefore we are ſtill forced to have recourſe to prophane authors, before we can determine when it has been introduced and when not: in ſome caſes, alſo, it was not poſſible for it to be introduced, that is, whenever the prophecies ſhall be thought to refer to diſtant future events, which the prophet could have never lived to ſee accompliſhed: ſtill farther, even in thoſe caſes, wherein a prophet may have actually thus arranged his predictions, agreeably to the order of accompliſhment in preference to that of delivery, he becomes, perhaps,

when he ſays concerning this ſubject, "Poſſumus tamen hoc dicere, quod et in prophetis nequaquam *hiſtoriæ ordo* ſervetur, duntaxat non in omnibus, ſed in *quibuſdam* locis. *In Ezech. c.* 30.

in

in theſe nothing better than a compiler of paſt events, like other hiſtorians, in conformity merely to his own private and human, therefore fallible judgment, and not from any ſuggeſtion of inſpired knowledge; ſo that he may be miſtaken in his opinion as to what prophecies were fulfilled by what events, he being in ſuch caſes only a human commentator upon his own predictions delivered before by divine inſpiration. This laſt imperfection, however, will only ſubſiſt in reſpect to thoſe readers (of which claſs are many learned Papiſts as well as Proteſtants) who conceive, that Divine inſpiration does not extend to the very phraſes, order, and method employed by each prophet, but only to the conceived truths themſelves; which were left to be delivered by the prophets in ſuch language and manner, as ſhould be ſuited to the education and capacity of each: for among thoſe on the contrary, who conſider inſpiration as extending even to phraſeology, method, and every other article of compoſition, the *accompliſhment* alſo of all prophecies, thus arranged in hiſtoric order, will to theſe become aſcertained by divine authority equally with the *predictions* themſelves; and this, even although the

the books of prophecy ſhould have been put into their preſent form by ſome later hand than the original author; in caſe this was ſtill done by ſome inſpired ſcribe, as according to the opinion of Simon. Nevertheleſs, even in the former of theſe two caſes, wherein the hiſtoric arrangement is to be conſidered only as a comment and fallible opinion, yet it is the comment of no ordinary perſon; therefore in *both* thoſe caſes they will become, if not exceptions to the opinion, that ſpiritus propheticus non eſt chronologicus, yet at leaſt important ſupplements to ſupply the want of ſuch an uſeful union; therefore conſiderable improvements upon the *firſt* rude order of *delivery*; although, indeed, ſtill not ſo complete as they might have been, and by no means adequate examples of this *ſecond* order of arrangement now under conſideration, that is, of an invariable union of delivery with chronology and hiſtory: which, however, as all parties ſeem to agree, is rather to be wiſhed than expected in prophetic communications; for as Jerome obſerves concerning the proper buſineſs of a prophet, it is, *non narrare præterita, ſed futura prenunciare, prout voluntas ſpiritus ſancti fuerit* *;

* Comm. in *Ezech. c.* 30,

and

and it would be unreaſoable to expect, that beſides this his proper buſineſs, the ſame perſon ſhould unite in himſelf all other ſcientific qualifications, whether with divine aſſiſtance or without, and become alſo both chronologer and hiſtorian, as well as antiquary and philoſopher.

But there is a *third* order of arrangement, which might and ought in all reaſonable expectation to be found in theſe prophetic exhortations to the Jewiſh people, juſt as well as in civil oratory among the Greeks and Romans; this is, ſuch a diſtribution of the ſeveral parts as ſhould appear to the authors conducive to the purpoſe of forcible *argumentation*, either in their political or religious expoſtulations with the Jews. In order to obtain this, it might be ſometimes expedient for them to interrupt the right chronologic and hiſtoric order of the events referred to, by placing two or more diſtant events contiguous to each other, whenever theſe could contribute to ſupply proofs of ſome general aſſertion or concluſion: at other times examples might be and were produced by the prophets of the exact completion of former prophecies by themſelves or others, in order the better to gain credit to the veracity of ſome farther prophecies, which

which they had lately or were about to deliver: ſometimes, alſo, a juxtapoſition of diſtant events would ſerve to point out the oppoſite fates, which followed from the belief or diſbelief, the obedience or diſobedience of the Jews in particular caſes: at other times a like juxtapoſition would be inſtrumental to a prophet's bringing together, into one view, his prophecies concerning ſimilar ſubjects, or concerning neighbouring nations, or ſimilar nations, ſuch as Heathens in diſtinction from Jews, or concerning ſimilar ranks of perſons in the ſame nation: accordingly they will be found ſometimes actually thus to arrange together their prophetic exhortations to the Jewiſh kings; and in like manner thoſe relative to the prieſts and prophets, and alſo thoſe relative to the people at large *. Theſe, and other kinds of method, will be found employed by all the prophets, juſt as it appeared to their judgment moſt convenient, in order to connect together their ſeveral *argumenta-*

* In *hiſtoria* id vero dicendum eſt, ea quæ de *una re* diverſis ſunt dicta temporibus, non debere oratione dividi, ſed unius loci narratione concludi, ut quæ de Ægypto dicta ſunt alio atque alio tempore, uno lectionis ordine cognoſcantur. *Hieron. in Ezech. c.* 30. He might have ſaid the ſame *de prophetia.*

tions,

tions, to avoid confuſion, and to render their tranſition from one ſubject to another more natural and obvious. This *third argumentative* order therefore muſt in courſe break in repeatedly upon the *two* foregoing ones, the order of *prophetic delivery* and that of *hiſtoric accompliſhment*: but there are, perhaps no portions whatever of the prophetic books to be found, wherein the prophecies do not in ſome properly connected manner thus riſe out of, and follow one another, in conformity to one or other of the above three methods of diſtribution; which, therefore, in conſequence become three principles of vindication to prove, that the prophetic books do not in fact contain any indication of ſuch diſorderly arrangement, as has been attributed to them, and as would neceſſarily ariſe from a collection of the ſeveral prophecies by ſome other hand, patched together by mere accident or without any preconceived plan; juſt as in the caſe of Horace's Odes, wherein there is no kind of order whatever to be found, neither the chronologic order of compoſition, nor that of ſimilar ſubjects, nor of ſimilar metres, nor any other.

By one or other then of theſe three principles we may juſtify the arrange-

ment of every prophecy in Iſaiah, Jeremiah, Ezechiel, or the others, and prove by a minute analyſis of each, that none of them do ever depart both from the *firſt* and *ſecond* orders of arrangement, unleſs when it is to ſubſtitute, in their place, ſome inſtance of the *third* and ſtill more uſeful method of diſtributing and connecting their ſeveral exhortations: we ought not, however, to expect the ſame art and ſkill as from perſons educated in the rhetorical ſchools of Athens and Rome; it will be ſufficient, if we ſhall diſcover ſuch a plan of arrangement, as ſhall indicate a connected tranſition every where, and conſequently the hand of ſome one perſon preſiding over and directing the whole, ſo as to form one continued exhortatory oration or prophetic poem out of the ſeveral parts: this is all that is wanting to remove the imputation thrown both by the favorors of eccleſiaſtic tradition and free-thinkers on thoſe prophetic books, as if they contained in ernal evidence of their having been compiled by ſome later hands than thoſe of their or ginal authors; and alſo to remove the perplexity of commentators in accounting for the pretended fact of diſorder, a fact which they have too haſtily allowed and apparently for no other reaſon

ſon than becauſe they did not find there a chronologic order, and had no idea of any other. Moreover that theſe books are writ in ſuch a highly figurative and hyperbolic manner, both in point of conception and expreſſion, as to partake of the nature of poetry, has been long allowed by all; and, if according to the new idea of the learned tranſlator of Iſaiah, it ſhall be alſo admitted, that they are writ in metre, agreeably to the moſt antient cuſtomary mode even of thoſe, who either wrote hiſtory, or who were wont *pandere oracula*; theſe circumſtances would form a farther reaſonable excuſe for the like bold and abrupt tranſitions, as are found even in the lyric poetry of the moſt correct ages of antiquity: but in truth there ſeems to me no occaſion for having recourſe to ſuch apologies as either want of ſkill in the compoſer, or the peculiar ſpecies of the compoſition; for on the contrary all the internal evidence which thoſe books contain with reſpect to their compilers, will rather be found in favour of the ſingle hand of the author of each preſiding throughout, and connecting the whole together in a continued ſtrain of argumentation, beyond what could be expected by the moſt orthodox believers, or demanded

manded by the moſt unreaſonable unbelievers in the authenticity of the ſcriptural canon. One might ſtill farther juſt as well pretend to conclude from the intricate and inverted order of narration and chronology in Herodotus, that his work was not put together by himſelf, altho' it begins agreeably to the ancient mode with prefixing his name, and claiming the ſubſequent work for his own; as to conclude from the like want of chronologic order in ſome parts of the prophets, that there was no order whatever to be found in them, and that thoſe books were not really compiled by themſelves, notwithſtanding that they alſo begin with prefixing their reſpective names according to the cuſtom even of prophane authors in thoſe ages, and are referred to in ſcripture as being the real compoſers of what they have thus claimed. Laſtly, this hypercriticiſm of the moderns proceeds even at the very outſet upon an erroneous maxim, by ſuppoſing, that the moſt natural, obvious, firſt and favorite order, which writers in *antient* times would adopt, was a regularly chronologic one; for as far as we are now able to look back into the conduct of antient ages, the very contrary appears to have been the real fact even in hiſtory, wherein

ſuch

ſuch a regular arrangement was moſt to be expected. Chronologic order ſeems to have been an invention of later times even in Greece itſelf; for, until the brief ſpecimen which Thucydides gave during the ſhort ſpace of 27 years, we have no example of the like method remaining, nor reaſon to believe that any had before ſubſiſted: for Herodotus had before this adopted the epic and epiſodic mode of narration; but that he was the inventor of it is more than we know; one may rather ſuſpect it to have been the natural offspring of the poetic romances, which had preceeded him and the birth of hiſtory: accordingly in modern times we find a ſimilar epiſodic method in Arioſto, and probably from a ſimilar cauſe, the inartificial method of narration in his archetype, the hiſtoric romances then in faſhion*. As chronologic order ſeems not

* M. Rochfort has juſtly obſerved, " Le paſſage de la poéſie hiſtorique à l'hiſtoire transformée en ſimples annales, ne fut pas ſi ſubit qu'on n'apperçût ſenſiblement les nuances des degradations. Pherecyde & Hecatée, qui affranchirent l'hiſtoire du rithme poetique, conſerverent encore tout ce qui tenoit à la poeſie. Herodote, Cteſias, Hellanicus ont été régardes comme les plus fabuleux des hiſtoriens. Il faut dont convenir, qu'alors l'hiſtoire tenoit encore beaucoup de la poeſie, & qu'elle n'étoit pas telle qu'on la conçut depuis, quand Thucydide en eut changé

to have had its birth before the time of Thucydides, ſo it did not arrive at any maturity until near the age of Alexander, along with that new ſpecies of hiſtory which Ephorus firſt attempted, that is, an *univerſal* one of both Greeks and Barbarians: thus the variety of matter and of cotemporary events in different nations firſt rendered a regular Chronology neceſſary to avoid confuſion, and the ſame neceſſity made it afterwards faſhionable; nevertheleſs we find, that Theopompus in the ſame age wrote nearly in the epiſodic manner of Herodotus*. So that a ſtrict chronologic order inſtead of being the firſt, was rather the lateſt mode

changé la forme." *Sur la morale d'Herodote. Mem. de l'Academ. tom.* 39. He might have ſaid the ſame of the intermediate gradations between epic arrangement and the chronologic order of annals.

* Digreſſionibus [παρεκβασεσι] variæ hiſtoriæ quamplurimis hiſtoricos ſuos implet libros Theopompus, Quamobrem Phillippus, digreſſionibus iſtis ſublatis, in ſedecim duntaxat libros redegit. *Photius cod.* 176. From the abſtract which Photius gives of his 12th book, it appears of what nature theſe digreſſions were; for after relating the aſſiſtance given by Acoris King of Egypt to Evagoras of Cyprus, he goes back exactly like Herodotus to the antiquities of Cyprus, and informs us how Agamemnon with the Greeks at firſt poſſeſſed themſelves of Cyprus with all the ſubſequent events; the ſame alſo concerning Pamphilia.

of

of narration, and even then only the neceſſary ſervant of method in very extenſive plans of hiſtory; from which inferiority of ſtation at its birth, it never afterwards exalted itſelf in the eſteem of men, not even in hiſtory, much leſs in prophetic admonitions of a patriotic and religious nature; which being fit ſubjects for rational argument, would naturally aſſume an argumentative and better method, than one which depended upon mere order of time: it has been the frequency and neceſſity of chronologic order, in modern ages, amidſt our preſent vaſt maſs of hiſtory; which has made it to be regarded with a more favorable eye by modern critics, than what in itſelf it deſerves, and as if it were always a neceſſary ingredient in method.

Upon the whole then, there was no occaſion for commentators to have been ſo much perplexed, and to have had recourſe to ſuch contradictory and yet unſatisfactory conjectures, in order to avoid the concluſions againſt the authenticity of the prophetic books, which Papiſts and Freethinkers unite in deducing from the want of chronologic order; they might have ſafely allowed this fact, and yet denied the concluſion, that thoſe books either were deſtitute of a fit and proper order, or were not

the

the uncorrupted productions of the prophets themſelves: but excepting Jerome, I find only two authors, who ſeem ſince to have had any idea of this, and theſe only juſt hint it in a very inſufficient and *general* manner. In oppoſition to Simon's opinion, of a *collection* of the ſcriptural books being made by later hands with little *hiſtoric additions*, Le Clerc *conjectures* (for that only is the force of his mode of expreſſion) "that the prophets themſelves gave their prophetic books to the public, and alſo they themſelves *added* thoſe *hiſtoric* particulars found there, in order that one might better comprehend on what occaſion they had pronounced the prophecies—by titles alſo being prefixed to ſome ſcriptural books and not to others, we may rather *conjecture* alſo that they, who made the collection of the Bible, have given us thoſe books juſt as they found them, without adding any thing *." Le Clerc then apparently means, that the prophets,

* Sentimens ſur l'hiſtoire critique de Simon: Lettre 9me. I ſhall quote ſome farther paſſages, that readers may ſee how far his opinion went concerning the uncorrupt ſtate of the prophetic books. "Si l'on pouvoit conjecturer quelque choſe de vraiſemblable ſur la maniere dont ces prophetics ont été conſervées, il ſemble que l'on devroit plutôt penſer, que les prophetes eux mêmes, ou quelques de leurs diſciples les ont écrites, comme

before they put their laſt hand to their works, interſperſed ſome *hiſtoric additions* for the benefit of their readers; this in courſe includes in it the fact which I have pointed out, that the authors arranged ſome prophecies at leaſt according to *hiſtoric order*, after thoſe events propheſied of had taken place, and before the death of the prophets. But Carpzovius concurs with me ſtill in more points than Le Clerc: he not only allows with Le Clerc, that the preſent body of prophecies are the genuine ones of the prophets without being corrupted by any *additions* of later collectors; but alſo that they are not fragments, and that even the preſent *diſpoſition* of them proceeded from the prophets themſelves, and that this diſpoſition was not made at random, but rather contrived with an expreſs view to ſome particular *uſeful end*; and this even in regard to

comme Baruc écrivit celle de Jeremie, et que c'eſt des *fragmens* de ces exemplaires, qu'on a *tiré* ce qui nous en reſte: mais on ne peut rien aſſurer dans une choſe ſi éloignée et ſi obſcure." *Do.* "On peut auſſi voir par les prophetes, dont il ne nous reſte que des fragmens, & qui ſont en aſſez grand déſordre, que c'eſt par la providence, qu'ils ont échappé à la perte generale des livres des Hebreux—dont on a enſuite formé le mieux qu'on a pû le corps des livres ſacrés: —mais ils nous les ont donné *tels qu'ils les avoient.*" Lettre, 7.

Jeremiah, the moſt intricate of them all in arrangement. " De Jeremia tamen affirmare liceat, et *ab ipſo Prophetâ hanc* vaticiniorum profectam eſſe *diſpoſitionem* nec *temerè digeſtam*, ſed impellente dei ſpiritu, *ſcopo que & fine ſingulari:* cum enim temporum ſeriem Regum & Chronicorum libri ſervent, & ad quam ætatem quodque referendum ſit vaticinium, edoceant, lucemque interpretationi oraculorum, per rerum geſtarum hiſtoriam, delineatamque reipublicæ juxta ac eccleſiæ faciem præferant; placuit, in diſponendo prophetico volumine, *argumenti* potius & *contentorum* rationem habere, & ita conſtruere ſingula, ut *ædificationi* gentis omnium que temporum eccleſiæ conducere videbatur. Quicqûid enim oraculorum hic comprehenditur, vel ad eccleſiam Judaicam ſpectat, vel ad extraneas gentes— partis prioris trajectiones nonnullæ ex *argumenti affinitate* vel *vaticiniorum complemento* rationem ſatis apertè produnt, aliæ vero tegunt adeo, ut nulla hactenus induſtria inveſtigari aut perſpicuè potuerit reddi*." However, Carpzovius here only expands a little the vague and *general* ideas of Jerome on this ſubject, as quoted above; for tho'

* Introductio ad libros Vet. Teſtam. p. 3. *cap.* 3. ſect. 4. Lipſiæ, 1727.

like

like him he maintains, that the preſent diſpoſition aims at the *utile* and *edification*, and that it has a certain *ſcopus finiſque*; yet he does not tell us what this *end* is, nor how it produces *inſtruction*, nor how the preſent diſpoſition tends to that ſuppoſed *end* in view; but he rather acknowledges at laſt with Lightfoot, that *difficile eſt dicere*: he obſerves indeed in *particular*, that the reaſon of ſome tranſgreſſions of chronologic order appear from the *affinity of the ſubject* or the *completion of prophecies*; but how either of theſe can juſtify the interruption of chronologic order, is not ſhewn; one would more naturally ſuppoſe, that they would rather lead to that order, or to one agreeable to the real ſucceſſion of events in hiſtory, than to the contrary. What Jerome therefore and Carpzovius have left undone I have endeavoured to ſupply; but whether this *ſcopus finiſque* in each prophet is to be conſidered merely as their own human work or *Deo impellente*, I muſt leave to others to collect from the nature of the execution of their reſpective plans of arrangement; it is my buſineſs only to delienate what the nature of theſe plans are.

The Prophecies in Ezechiel vindicated from the Accuſations of Diſorder in Arrangement, of containing only Fragments, or of having been put together by ſome Collector later than the Prophet himſelf.

ISAIAH is the moſt ſimple of any in the arrangement of his prophecies; Ezechiel the next; and Jeremiah the moſt complex of all; therefore before we proceed to apply the foregoing principles to the vindication of Iſaiah, let us try the effect of their application to Ezechiel; hereby, perhaps, we ſhall be led to form a favourable preſumption of their application to Iſaiah likewiſe: for when by this example we ſhall have gained juſt conceptions of the oratorical and argumentative arrangement, which is to be found in the prophets, we ſhall be better able to trace out the chronologic and hiſtoric order, in which their predictions were either delivered or accompliſhed; and we may be induced to conclude, in oppoſition to Vitringa, the tranſlator, and many others, that there is no diſorder in the arrangement of the five firſt chapters of Iſaiah any more than throughout Ezechiel and the remainder of Iſaiah himſelf.

Com-

Commentators have been greatly diſtreſſed about the firſt date in Ezechiel "*the 30th year*," and have formed many conjectures concerning the Epoch, from which it is reckoned; yet after all, as I apprehend, they have left unnoticed the real Epoch referred to by the author: however, as none of them make this 30th year in the firſt verſe to fall *later* then the date by *the 5th of the captivity* in the ſecond verſe, it would be foreign to our preſent purpoſe to enter into any enquiry concerning this ſubject; at ſome future opportunity perhaps I may, but at preſent it is ſufficient to obſerve, that if the dates by different epochs in theſe two verſes be not cotemporary, yet at leaſt there is no deviation here from the chronologic order in which theſe viſions were ſeen and *delivered* *.

Ezechiel then, beginning with this viſion in the *5th year*, proceeds regularly to date his following viſions agreeably to the order of time, in which they were ſeen by him and *delivered* to the Jews, namely, in the *5th*, *6th*, *7th*, *9th*, *and* 11*th* years of the captivity of Jehoiakin †. Of theſe therefore

* Chap. 1. ver. 1 and 2.

† Chap. 8. 1.—ch. 20. 1.—ch. 24. 1.—ch. 26. 1.

only

only that requires any remark, which is dated "in the 9th year, the 10th month, the 10th day of the month," this is the date of the commencement of the ſiege of Jeruſalem, and agrees exactly with the date of the ſame fact in Jeremiah (lii. 4.) by the years of the reign of Zedekiah: hence it follows, that in all their other dates both prophets reckoned in the ſame manner, that is either both *incluſively* or both *excluſively* of the 11th of Jehoiakim; ſo that the 6th, 7th, &c. of the *captivity* in the one, coincided with the 6th, 7th, &c. of the *reign* of Zedekiah in the other.

The viſion *delivered* in the 11*th* year relates to the deſtruction of Tyre; and after this we meet with the firſt example of the prophet's departure from the *order of delivery*; for the next following viſion (in ch. xxix. 1.) is dated as early as the 10*th* year. Here then, objectors may ſay, is an inſtance of diſorderly arrangement; for the viſion in the 10*th* ought to have preceeded that in the 11th. No, we ought rather firſt to examine whether he had not a better object in view than chronologic order, and whether in departing here from the order of *delivery*, he does not adopt the more uſeful orders either of *hiſtoric accompliſhment*, or of convenient diſpoſition for the purpoſe of *oratorical*

torical argumentation, or both. For inſtance, after the viſion againſt Tyre, ſeen in the 11th year, againſt whom is the following viſion ſeen in the 10th directed? againſt Pharaoh king of Egypt. Now we know both from the concluſion of this 29th chapter, and alſo from prophane authors, referred to by Joſephus *, that the ſiege of Tyre was firſt *accompliſhed*, and the invaſion of Egypt not until afterwards; juſt as Ochus and Alexander, in later times, did neither of them venture into Egypt, untill they had firſt ſecured the maritime towns of Paleſtine: in theſe two viſions then it is plain, that the prophet departs from the order of *delivery* in order to ſubſtitute that more inſtructive hiſtoric order, in which the events were *accompliſhed*. For hereby he at the ſame time informs us concerning his own opinion of the two events, by which his two viſions againſt Tyre and Egypt were fulfilled; a piece of intelligence highly uſeful to readers of *prophetic Scripture*; more eſpecially if what Huetius above and biſhop Hurd ſuggeſt be true, that it was not only conſiſtent with Divine preſcience but proper and expedient for prophecies to

* Antiq. 10. 11. and Adver. Appion, lib. 1.

include

include ſome degree of obſcurity in them †. But as it is not contended by any, that it is expedient for the *accompliſhment* of thoſe prophecies always to remain obſcure and undeterminable; toward the removal then of this latter obſcurity, the frequent adoption of *hiſtoric order* by Ezechiel and the others becomes very inſtrumental, and ſerves as an excellent comment upon their own prophetic text, to point out when their viſions were verified ‡. Moreover, ſince all parties ſeem to agree, that a foreſight of *hiſtoric order* is not to be claimed as a gift communicated to prophets; Ezechiel, therefore, muſt have acquired this hiſtoric knowledge in a natural and human way; conſequently he muſt have outlived the invaſion of Egypt, and have not put his prophecies into their preſent order until after this event: ſo that hereby alſo we ſhall be often enabled to diſcover, what tradition has not tranſmitted, that is, the term of years, or nearly, to which Ezechiel and the reſt extended the duration of their lives.

The preceding example of deviation from the order of *delivery*, is followed by another

† Sermons on Prophecy, p. 73.

‡ Oraculorum obſcuritas per ipſos demum eventus rerum erat illuſtranda. *Huet.* vid. p. 136.

inſtance

inſtance of the ſame; but in which, inſtead of the order of *hiſtoric accompliſhment*, the prophet adopts the ſtill more uſeful order of *argumentative diſpoſition*: for he proceeds to relate five more viſions, ſeen according to the following dates; 1*ſt*, in the 27th year and firſt month; 2*d*, in the 11th year and firſt month; 3*d*, in the 11th year and third month; 4*th*, in the 12th year and twelfth month; 5*th*, in the 12th year and fifteenth day*. Now againſt whom are all theſe viſions directed? They are all directed againſt Egypt, juſt as well as that in the 10th, juſtified in the foregoing paragraph; ſo that at leaſt the remark of Jerome above may be here juſtly applied, "That this juxtapoſition of what relates to the ſame nation or the ſame ſubject is a ſufficient degree of order even in hiſtory," much more in prophecies delivered before the hiſtoric order could be known even by the prophet himſelf. It may, however, perhaps be farther objected here; that in doing thus Ezechiel might nevertheleſs have eaſily become ſtill more methodical, by not placing the viſion ſeen againſt Egypt in the 27th year before

* Chap. xxix. ver. 17.—chap. xxx. ver. 20.—chap. xxxi. 1.—chap. xxxii. 1.—chap. xxxii. 17.

thoſe againſt Egypt ſeen in the 11th and 12th years, but rather after them, whereby they would have all followed in the right chronologic order of *delivery*. But to this it is ſufficient to reply, that all the regularity of method ought not, perhaps, to be expected in the artleſs age of Ezechiel, which might obtain in the rhetorical times of Greece and Rome; juſt as even among thoſe antients we may perhaps find them ſometimes leſs accurate in method, than is agreeable to the practice of authors in modern times: ſo that no concluſion can be drawn hence, that theſe viſions conſiſt of mere fragments put together at random; which is all that we want to prove, and not that Ezechiel was as great an adept in rhetorical diſpoſition as Demoſthenes and Cicero.

Laſtly, if there ſhould be any objectors, who ſhall not be contented even with a juxtapoſition under theſe circumſtances, as preſerving a ſufficient degree of method, and ſhall require ſome farther reaſon ſtill for the inſertion of that viſion in the 27th year ſo abruptly in a place, where it breaks in upon the regular order of *delivery*; yet it will not be difficult to aſſign ſuch a reaſon as they require, if they will perſiſt in requiring

from

from Ezechiel every accuracy of method, which can be conceived: for it may be ſhewn, that this viſion in queſtion was inſerted there, not through accidental negligence, but on purpoſe and with an expreſs view to *argumentative* diſpoſition; the nature of which I will now explain, and which I have only deferred thus long, leſt any one ſhould preſume that I was fond of over-refinement in this ſubject, and induſtrious to attribute to the prophet views, reaſons, and a plan of connexion, which had never entered his head, but was only ſpun out of my own. But if they will inſiſt, that a man of God ought to write with a very cloſe connexion and method, and are not ſatisfied with thoſe more rude though perhaps ſufficient methods of connexion, which I have already pointed out; what can be more unreaſonable and inconſiſtent, than if they ſhall now object alſo to a ſtill more artificial method of diſtribution, which I am about to diſplay, under pretence that it is too refined for Jewiſh prophets to have had in view; although, in fact, it will be found no other than what Moſes himſelf has dictated to them in his law, and what accordingly they all have obediently employed in all the prophetic books? Such a conduct

in objectors, as ſhall thus equaly find fault with not only all artificial, but alſo all rude methods of arrangement, unleſs it be only with that ſingle uſeleſs as well as rude method, which they have alone ſought for in the prophetic books, a regular chronologic order of *delivery*; will not this betray a mere ſpirit of cavil, which will rather change ſides, than not find ſomething wrong, in caſe it be different from what they wiſh to find? It was a like perverſeneſs, which Jeſus reproved in the criticiſms of the Jews upon his own conduct, who thus, like croſs-grained children, would neither join in mirth, nor yet in ſorrow either, but were clamorous at one moment for the very things which they condemned at the next*. Now in order to diſcern the nature of this *argumentative* diſpoſition here, we may previouſly obſerve, that as Ezechiel has arranged by a juxtapoſition his ſeveral prophecies againſt Tyre and Sidon in particular, and alſo thoſe againſt Egypt in particular †, ſo has he alſo done the ſame in regard to his prophecies againſt the Jews and Heathens

* Luke vii. 32.

† The firſt from the beginning of the xxvi. chap to the end of the xxviiith. the ſecond from the xxixth. to the xxxii d.

in

in general * ; and the latter in the following order, firſt againſt the Ammonites, next againſt the Moabites, then the Edomites ; after theſe againſt the Philiſtins, then againſt Tyre and Sidon, and laſtly againſt Egypt ; the 2d however againſt Egypt is dated later, viz. in the 27th year, than the ſubſequent one, which is as early as the 11th. Here then, as I mentioned before, is a *ſecond* deviation from the order of *delivery*, in the place of which I ſay, that the prophet now ſubſtitutes an *argumentative* diſpoſition of the following nature. All the prophets will be found to appeal repeatedly to the *accompliſhment* of former prophecies, delivered by themſelves or others, againſt the Jews and Heathens, as an *argument* of the veracity of ſome later prophecies, which they have ſince delivered, but were not yet *accompliſhed* ; and this is the nature of Ezechiel's *argumentative* method here. We ſhall afterwards have occaſion to point out a ſimilar example in Iſaiah ; at preſent we may obſerve, in regard to Jeremiah, that

* The former are contained in the twenty-four firſt chapters, down to the ſiege of Jeruſalem : the latter extend from the twenty-fifth to the thirty-ſecond. Then follow thoſe againſt the Jews again from the capture of Jeruſalem to the return from captivity.

beſides

beſides many examples of the like argument, he expreſſly informs us to the ſame purport in chap. xxviii. where his reaſoning is as follows †, "As our prophets of old predicted evil to many kingdoms, which evils have accordingly, as we all know, actually come upon them, and therefore we juſtly allow thoſe to be true prophets ſent from God; ſo in like manner this preſent pretended prophet Hannaniah, who now predicts peace to the Jews, ought not to have credit with them as a true prophet, until the event has juſtified him by the actual eſtabliſhment of peace again: but they ought rather to give credit to my words in ſtill predicting evil to them, becauſe I predict nothing different from former ones, nothing more than what has been before propheſied alſo by thoſe very prophets of old, Iſaiah and others, many of whoſe predictions of evil concerning the great heathen kingdoms around us have already been fulfilled, and have thereby (if ye believe not *me*) yet

† "The prophets, which have been before me and thee of old, propheſied both againſt many countries and againſt great kingdoms, of war, and of evil, and of peſtilence. The prophet that propheſieth of peace, when the word of the prophet *ſhall come to paſs*, then ſhall the prophet be known, that the Lord hath truly ſent him." *Chap.* xxviii. 8.

juſtly

juſtly gained credit to *them* for the like predictions of evil againſt the Jews, which are not yet fulfilled; but which, as I now in confirmation of them predict again, will ſtill ſoon be fulfilled likewiſe." In like manner Ezechiel himſelf obſerves, "When this cometh to paſs (ſo it will come) then ſhall they know, that a prophet hath been among them" (xxxiii. 33.) Iſaiah had before informed us to the very ſame purport*, as did our Saviour likewiſe afterwards, "Now I have told you before it is come to paſs, that when it is come to paſs, ye might believe, † viz. might believe in me as a true prophet concerning other promiſes and predictions, which will not be ſo ſoon accompliſhed, but will yet as certainly be verified at laſt; which words of Jeſus ſome critics have traduced by not rightly attending to the nature of the argument here in agitation. In theſe two laſt inſtances indeed, appeal is made only to events which *ſhall be* accompliſhed: but in the preceding caſes, from Jeremiah and Iſaiah, appeal is alſo made to *paſt* events propheſied of and

* "Behold the former things are come to paſs, and new things do I declare, before they ſpring forth, I tell you of them, xlii. 9."

† John xiv. 29.

al-

already arrived, as well as to *future ones:* another inſtance of this occurs again in chap. l. 18. "God *will* puniſh the king of Babylon as he *has* puniſhed the king of Aſſyria, and he *will* bring Iſrael again to his habitation." Here appeal is made in like manner to a *paſt* event predicted by former prophets againſt Aſſyria, and actually accompliſhed, when Jeremiah ſpoke this; the fulfillment of which prophecy is here employed as an argument to confirm that the remainder of thoſe antient prophecies, the reſtoration of Iſrael, and the deſtruction of Babylon, will be fulfilled likewiſe. In fine, this is only agreeable to the direction of Moſes himſelf, who has dictated this very argument in Deuter. *.

* When a prophet ſpeaketh in the name of the Lord, if the things follow not, nor come to paſs, that is a thing which the Lord hath not ſpoken; but the prophet hath ſpoken it preſumptuouſly, thou ſhalt not be afraid of him." xviii. 22. "Prophetarum θεοπνευσλων nonnulli, ut certo ſcimus, θεοπνευσλιαν ſuam miraculis comprobaverunt: veriſimile eſt etiam alios omnes aliqua divinæ potentiæ indicia ſatis aperte præ ſe tuliſſe: habebant procul dubio, unde auctoritatem ſuam plene confirmare, dictis que ſuis *fidem* adſtruere, valerent." *Diſſert: general: Kennicotti ad Bibl. Hebraic.* p. 3. The author here refers to only ſupernatural proofs of their veracity; but this, which is pointed out by Moſes, and ſo repeatedly employed by them is merely a natural and human proof,

Let us then ſee how Ezechiel employs this *argument* in the caſe under conſideration above. After he has arranged his prophecies (firſt) againſt the Jews, by themſelves and in the right chronologic order of *delivery*; (ſecondly) againſt the Heathens, by themſelves likewiſe and either in the right order of *delivery*, or in the hiſtoric order of *accompliſhment*: he then (thirdly) proceeds to confirm and gain credit to them all, more eſpecially to his laſt againſt the great and antient kingdom of Egypt, the greateſt novelty and leaſt probable prediction of any (for neither Iſaiah nor Jeremiah had predicted this complete deſolation of it, which is now threatened by Ezechiel),* this, there-

proof, yet perhaps not the leſs ſtrong for that reaſon either in the judgment of the learned or unlearned part of their audience.

* What Iſaiah had propheſied againſt Egypt there is no reaſon to extend farther, than to the invaſion of it by Sennacherib, and this was already accompliſhed. Jeremiah's predictions againſt Egypt do not appear to relate to any thing more than to the deſtruction of that army of Egyptians, with which Pharaoh-Necho had invaded Paleſtine, at the acceſſion of Nebuchadnezzar; and this was alſo accompliſhed. That nothing in the 46th chap. of Jeremiah can with any good reaſon be ſuppoſed to refer to ſtill later events, than the overthrow of that identical army and king, ſeems to appear from ver. 16 and 17.

fore, as ſtanding moſt in need of confirmation, he proceeds to verify in the following argumentative manner. His viſion againſt Tyre is dated in the 11*th* year, not many years before the ſiege began, which laſted thirteen years; but Ezechiel having lived to ſee it finiſhed and his prediction fulfilled, ſubjoins to his firſt prophecy againſt Egypt an *hiſtoric recital* of the actual accompliſhment of his viſion againſt Tyre, in order to gain credit to thoſe againſt Egypt, and in the following words, "In the 27th year the word of the Lord came unto me ſaying, Nebuchadnezzar cauſed his army to ſerve a great ſervice againſt Tyrus; yet had he no wages; therefore ſaith the Lord, I will give him the land of Egypt for a ſpoil" (c. xxix. 19.) accordingly we know, that *before* the 27th year after the captivity of Jehoiakin (the 16th after that of Zedekiah) the ſiege of Tyre was actualy finiſhed *; the firſt part

* An extract from the Tyrian Annals, by Joſephus (contr. App. l. 1.) is what our chronologers have chiefly made uſe of for fixing the time of the *commencement* and *end* of the ſiege of Tyre: this extract, however, is not without its difficulties, and theſe ſuch as prove ſtill more, how repeatedly Joſephus has confounded together the conqueſt of Media by Cyrus, and his conqueſt of Babylon twenty years later. The errors of Joſephus here having been ſufficiently canvaſſed

therefore of this paſſage is merely *hiſtorical* of a paſt event, agreeably to the natural force

canvaſſed by others, I have only to obſerve, that Jackſon has alſo hence endeavoured to deduce a proof of there being an error of two years in the Chaldæan æra: which is, however, totally void of good foundation; for Jackſon ſets out with an erroneous and merely conjectural ſenſe of his own, which he puts upon the above words of Ezechiel; he aſſerts "that Tyre was taken—in the 26th year of Jehoiakin's captivity—this is evident from Ezechiel xxix. 17, where Tyre is mentioned as being taken in the 27th year—this ſhews that Tyre was taken in the latter end of *the year before.*" v. 1. p. 376. "I have proved above, that Tyre was taken in the 26th year—which places the taking of Babylon by Cyrus two years lower than the Canon of Ptolomy, which plainly wants two years in the interval between Nebuchadnezzar and the taking of Babylon by Cyrus." p. 379. Yet certain it is, that the above words of Ezechiel can prove nothing more, than that Tyre was taken *before* the 27th year, but whether one, two, or three years *before*, does not appear: if it was begun in the very next year after the deſtruction of the Temple, viz. in the Chaldæan year 163, (which is one year later than in other authors) it would ſtill be ended in 176 (it having laſted thirteen years) and this is ſtill three years before the 27th year in Ezechiel. So that Jackſon's reaſoning proves nothing againſt the Chaldæan æra, unleſs he could make good his aſſertion either by Ezechiel or the Tyrian annals, that Tyre was not taken before the 26th year, which cannot be done; and even then it would ſtill be a doubt, whether Joſephus might not have made an error of a year or two in his extract from them, as eaſily as an error of twenty years

of the words employed; and having thus *confirmed* his prediction againſt Tyre by relating an account of its actual accompliſhment, he introduces this *narration* as a preface to the remainder of his viſions againſt Egypt, in order to gain the greater credit to them all; four more of which he proceeds to ſubjoin, which had, however, been all *delivered* before the capture of the leaſt, if not before the invaſion of Tyre; for they are dated in the 11th or 12th years. From the ſame ſource and *argumentative* method ariſe the frequent intermixture, of hiſtoric narrations concerning the accompliſhment of paſt prophecies with new predictions of future events, to be found in all the prophetic books. Theſe narrations are conſpicuouſly diſtinguiſhed in the learned tranſlator's edition of Iſaiah by being in proſe, while the prophecies are in metre;

certainly here made by him in regard to Cyrus. I may add farther, that Jackſon's approbation, after Scaliger and Petavius, of their conceiving της αυλης to refer to Ειθωβαλου underſtood, and not to Ναβυχοδονοσορου does indeed remove an inconvenient ſenſe of εβδομω, but introduces one quite immaterial in its place, and which is intirely uſeleſs in computation by the Tyrian Annals. Vignoles's correction therefore ſeems preferable, which reads εικοστω inſtead of εβδομω.

and

and theſe are apparently what Simon means by "the hiſtories, which ſerve to the illuſtration of prophecies," (vid. p. 130,) and which he erroneouſly ſuppoſed to have been *additions* made by later collectors, but which on the contrary now appear not only original but even neceſſary parts of the argumentative arrangement. Le Clerc, however, had more juſtly obſerved, that they ſeemed to be at leaſt original productions of the prophets themſelves, yet by his ſuppoſing them to have been all *added* by the prophets afterwards, he plainly did not diſcover what neceſſary parts ſome were in the connexion and reaſoning, nor conſequently that theſe prophetic orations could have never ſubſiſted without them from the firſt of their compilation tho' not delivery.

The very ſame hiſtorical *argument* employed by Ezechiel in the laſt example, will be found uſed by him again in his *third* viſion againſt Egypt, dated alſo in the 11th year (ch. 31.) where in like manner he introduces this, by prefacing it with another *hiſtoric recital*, namely, of a prophecy by Iſaiah then juſt fulfilled by the deſtruction of the great kingdom of Aſſyria at Niniveh. Chronologers have been at a loſs to determine at what

what period to fix this event: I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew in my *reſearches*, that on the evidence of Euſebius they have placed it many years too early; and that it could not have happened ſooner than about the *beginning* of Zedekiah's reign. However, at any rate it was a recent event; and ſuch an important one to the Jews, ſo long predicted by former prophets, and accompliſhed (as I contend) within a year or two after the captivity of Jehoiakin, could ſcarcely fail of being noticed in a very particular manner, by Jeremiah and Ezechiel, almoſt as ſoon as this cotemporary event took place. Accordingly Jeremiah firſt mentions it as *paſt*, next after his prophecy againſt Elam (Perſia) in the *beginning* of Zedekiah's reign, which invaſion of Elam was apparently affected by the joint forces of Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar *, as was alſo certainly the captivity of Jehoiakin before this †, and moreover

* "The word of the Lord, which came againſt Elam in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah." *Jerem.* xlix. 34.

† [Φησι] τον ακουσανλα Ναβουχοδονοσορ τα ὑπο Ιερεμιε προμαντευδενλα παρακαλεσαι Ασλιβαρην τον Μηδων βασιλεα συσ]ρατευειν αυτω—και τα Ιεροσολυμα παραλαβειν και τον Ιεδαιων βασιλεα Ιωκειμ ζωγρησαι." *Polyhiſtor apud Euſebii præp. Evang. lib.* 10. It appears from Cteſias, copied by

the deſtruction of Aſſyria afterwards *, and all within a few years of each other. But Ezechiel does not mention this event as *paſt* until here in the *laſt* year of Zedekiah; and it appears alſo from Herodotus, that it could not have happened ſooner than between theſe two captivities at Jeruſalem, a little after the accompliſhment of the like prophecies againſt the Jews had begun, and before they were fully compleated †. After

by Diodorus, that the Aſiatics called Cyaxares by the name of *Aſtibara*; this capture of Jehoiakim was in the 5th year before the death of Cyaxares. See the table at the end.

* Tobit. xiv. 15.

† According to the order of narration in Herodotus the capture of Niniveh was the laſt event in the reign of Cyaxares, and after the expulſion of the Scythians; who ruled twenty-two years beforethey were expelled from Media, and twenty-eight before their total expulſion from Aſia, reckoned from their victory over Cyaxares during his firſt attempt on Niniveh. Now Euſebius, for reaſons which will be produced in my *Reſearches*, ſeems to have preſerved from ſome prophane author nearly the true date of that firſt attempt on Niniveh, viz. about the third year of 40th Olymp. the 130th Ch. year from which incluſively to the fourth of Zedekiah, are only twenty-ſix years, therefore Cyaxares muſt have expelled the Scythians from Media about the time, that he aſſiſted Nebuchadnezzar againſt Jehoiakim, and in the remaining four years of his reign they jointly took Niniveh, and recovered Perſia; which during

Ezechiel then had announced all his prophecies againſt the ſeveral heathen nations bordering on Judea, he could not conclude more perſuaſively, than by thus confirming once more the certainty of the accompliſhment of all he had announced, nor better

during the invaſion of the Scythians had revolted from the Medes; and, as Herodotus hints, was not recovered until after their expulſion. (See note, p. 193.)

That Nebuchadnezzar had aſſiſted againſt the Perſians *after* the acceſſion of Zedekiah we know from Jeremiah, and alſo that he had aſſiſted in the invaſion of the Scythian territories after their expulſion we know from Megaſthenes in Euſebius, as will be ſeen below: all theſe events then muſt have happened within the firſt four years of Zedekiah, or very little ſooner. It was alſo probably the death of Cyaxares, in the fourth of Zedekiah, which induced the falſe prophet, Hannaniah, to predict in that ſame year, the return of the Jews from captivity through the human proſpect, that under the new king Aſtyages this confederacy between the Medes and Babylonians might be broken. Hence it appears, that Euſebius, as well as all modern authors, muſt have placed the *final* capture of Niniveh many years too ſoon. Biſhop Newton ſays in his *Diſſert. on Prophecies*, Vol. I. p. 269. "The prophet Zephaniah in the days of Joſiah foretold the ſad event [concerning Niniveh]—it was taken by the Medes and Babylonians—from that time no mention is made of Niniveh by any of the ſacred writers," This aſſertion is true only in caſe it be confined to the very name *Niniveh*; for we have ſeen that both Jeremiah and Ezechiel make mention of the *kingdom of Aſſyria*, but as no longer ſubſiſting.

confirm

confirm this certainty than by closing his long catalogue with the same argument as before, that is, by a second appeal to facts, to the actual completion of another prophecy, viz. that antient one of Isaiah and others, against the great kingdom of Assyria at Niniveh, which had so long ruled with a rod of iron over Asia; but was then lately brought to ruin agreeably to those predictions. Such a recent event and evident proof both of the providence and judgments of the God of Israel, as well as of the certainty of predictions by his prophets, could not but strike all his readers with awe, and fix the belief of the most wavering: accordingly Ezechiel seems to dwell upon this argument and example with a peculiar energy, presenting it to our view in a great variety of oratorical lights, "Behold (says he) the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon, with fair branches and of high stature—not any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in beauty: Therefore, thus *said* the Lord, because his heart is lifted up in height, I have delivered him into the hand of the mighty one of the heathen, he *shall* surely deal with him, &c.—Thus *said* the Lord *, In

* The interpreters and commentators sometimes lead us into difficulties, and then leave us in the midst

the day that he went down to the grave I cauſed Lebanon to mourn for him; I made

of uncertainty and diſtreſs to extricate ourſelves if we can. Here, for inſtance, Le Clerc omits the name *Aſſyrian*, though it is in both the Hebrew and Septuagint, and applies all this chapter to the king of Egypt; in conſequence he puts every verb in the *future* tenſe, as refering to the future deſtruction of Egypt. On the contrary the Septuagint renders every verb in the *paſt* tenſe, as referring to the *paſt* deſtruction of Aſſyria, and even this ſentence alſo, *he ſhall ſurely deal with him*; which alone the Engliſh tranſlation has rendered in the *future*, adhering in this more ſtrictly to the Hebrew than either of the former tranſlations. Tremellius agrees with the Engliſh; but the Latin Vulgate and Jerome, differ from all the above four, for they render ſome verbs in the *paſt* and ſome in the *future:* however, the *future* occurs with them only in ſome ſentences ſubſequent to "He ſhall ſurely deal with him," and before the repetition of "Thus ſaith the Lord;" they do not therefore differ materially from the Engliſh. For what follows the firſt phraſe "Thus ſaid the Lord" they all three conſider as a prophecy delivered by others *before* the ruin of Aſſyria, and to be only here *related* by Ezechiel, in order to prove how exactly the event correſponded with that prophecy delivered *before*: this prophecy, therefore, ought to be in the *future*, as the Engliſh has rightly rendered it; but the Vulgate and Jerome extend this prophetic part farther than thoſe words, "He ſhall ſurely deal with him," and as far as to the repetition of "Thus ſaith the Lord:" in this only they differ from the Engliſh; conſequently they all underſtand the deſtruction of Aſſyria to be *paſt*, as well as the Septuagint, in the 11th of Zedekiah, when this *narration* is dated, and they all

agree

the nations to ſhake at the ſound of his fall, when I caſt him down to hell with them that deſcend into the pit." xxxi. 3. Ezechiel has been always conſidered as a great maſter in the terrible ſtyle; this and the following

agree to this chapter being merely *hiſtorical* concerning Aſſyria, except Le Clerc, who conſiders it as *prophetical* throughout concerning Egypt; tho' in reality only the ſecond and laſt verſes are ſo, in which the *paſt* fate of Aſſyria is ſet forth as prophetic of the *future* fate of Egypt. Jerome expreſsly ſays, Rex Aſſyrius eo jam tempore captus fuerat a Chaldæis; and we know from Herodotus that this could not be later than the death of Cyaxares, although neither could it be much ſooner, otherwiſe all the events related by Herodotus, under Cyaxares, could not be included within the forty years of his reign. It is moreover confirmed by a computation in Tobit; for Tobias died at 127 years old, and before his death heard of the capture of Niniveh (14. 15.): now he was born before the capture of Samaria, by Salmanaſſar (ver. 9. and 10.) and probably not long before; that capture was at the end of the twenty-eighth Ch. year, and the death of Cyaxares on the fourth of Zedekiah was in the 155th year; from which deduct twenty-eight, there remain 127, the very age of Tobias. Hence it appears, that the book of Tobit, though as full of fabulous tales as Livy, yet was not a merely invented romance, but extracted from ſome authentic family memoirs, which had tranſmitted down, with accuracy, the diſtance of time between the capture of Samaria and of Niniveh, among a variety of traditions, which however fabulous, yet will be found ſuitable to the manners and character of that age and people in Media.

chapter are conſpicuous in that reſpect; the ſubject in both is indeed well ſuited to ſupport the ſtyle, ſince they contain a recital of the ſucceſſive deſtruction of all the great kingdoms of Aſia, which are here ſhewn to have all ſerved only as inſtruments in the hands of the God of Iſrael to effect his purpoſes, agreeably to what had been foretold by his prophets; many of which nations were then actually brought to ruin, and the reſt conſigned to the ſame fate ſoon after: of theſe the fate of the firſt mentioned and greateſt kingdom was then actually paſt; on this he beſtows the whole preſent chapter, and it is evident throughout, that this hiſtoric recital is expreſſly brought as an *argumentative* confirmation of his own veracity in declaring, that Egypt would ſoon after meet with the like fate; this is particularly indicated by the concluding ſentence, which ſerves as a moral to the preceding funeral panegyric over Aſſyria "To whom art thou [Egypt] thus like in glory and greatneſs, yet ſhalt thou be brought down, thou ſhalt lie with them that be ſlain with the ſword; ſuch is Pharaoh and all his multitude, ſaith the Lord."

The ſame *argumentative* view and connexion in the arrangement of theſe prophe-

cie

cies is again evident in the ſubſequent *fourth* and *fifth* viſions againſt Egypt in the 12th year, (chap. xxxii.) where we once more find introduced an *hiſtoric narration* of the fates of *all* the nations of Aſia, as actually *accompliſhed* agreeably to his predictions concerning them in his foregoing prophecies; which narration of events thus accompliſhed before he had put theſe prophecies together, are ſubjoined to ſome farther prophecies here againſt Egypt not accompliſhed until afterwards, for the ſame purpoſe as above, to gain credit to the veracity of theſe laſt likewiſe: and this is a proof that the prophet muſt have either ſurvived all the events thus hiſtorically related, or elſe that he muſt have *compiled* this prophetic oration under ſupernatural influence; and divine inſpiration muſt have extended to theſe *hiſtoric relations*, as well as to the events themſelves predicted; to which laſt opinion, tho' different from that of many learned men, I can ſee no objection; for he who believes in a prophet's prediction of future events, what difficulty can he have to believe ſtill farther in the ſame prophet's being enabled to *relate* in right *hiſtoric order* the particulars of future events as if paſt, yet before they were really accompliſhed? There ſeems to be no difference

ference between theſe two exertions in power; but merely in mode and form. Ezechiel begins his *fourth* viſion with directing "To take up a lamentation alſo for Pharaoh king of Egypt;" that is, to the preceding funeral panegyric over Aſſyria, the fate of which was *paſt*, when he *delivered* this prophecy in the 12th year, he prophetically ſubjoins a ſimilar panegyric over Egypt, tho' its fate was ſtill *future*, making plainly *here* a happy variation only in the oratorical figure of προ ομματων ποιειν; for by that figure paſt events are brought down and repreſented as now preſent before our eyes, whereas on the contrary by this prophetic figure future events are anticipated and repreſented as already viſibly paſt. His *fifth* viſion (ver. 17.) differs in its nature from the *fourth* only in this reſpect, that in the fourth the accompliſhed prophecy againſt Aſſyria, on which his *argument* is founded, was certainly paſt, when this viſion was *delivered* in the 12th year: whereas in the fifth the prophecies there related as accompliſhed againſt ſome of the heathen nations were certainly future to the *delivery* of this fifth viſion againſt Egypt in the 12th year, yet accompliſhed, perhaps, before he put his finiſhing hand to the *arrangement* of this part of his book; while the fate of Egypt

Egypt was ſtill future even to theſe events thus hiſtorically related here.

That this preſent funeral panegyric over theſe other heathen nations is in no caſe another inſtance of anticipation, by that prophetic figure employed before, is evident from the context: for that figurative lamentation before over Egypt was immediately followed by various predictions againſt Egypt all in the future tenſe, which therefore proved the lamentation to be an anticipation of its *future* fate; whereas in the preſent viſion the lamentations againſt Egypt, (which begin and conclude the chapter) can alone relate to a future event; for the fates of the three Aſiatic nations, firſt mentioned here, were already certainly *paſt*, even before the date of the *delivery* in the 12th year, viz. Aſhur, Elam, and Meſhech (Aſſyria, Perſia and Scythia): this gives us reaſon to conclude, that the fates of the two remaining and laſt mentioned Aſiatic nations, Edom and Sidon, were *paſt* alſo, before he *arranged* at leaſt this part of his book, tho' not before he *delivered* the reſt of this chapter in the 12th year *; and that he

* Quinto poſt excidium Hieroſolymæ anno Nabuchodonoſor cum magnis copiis invaſit Cælo Syriam, qua

made this *hiſtoric addition* in later times than the *delivery*, to ſtrengthen his *argument* drawn from the completion of prophecies againſt the firſt three nations there mentioned as *paſt* at the time of *delivery*; or elſe that he ſometimes wrote hiſtories prophetically. Why he ſhould chooſe to make this *addition* concerning the Edomites in particular, as well as indeed concerning the Sidonians and Tyrians alſo (which laſt ſeem included, tho' not named) we may eaſily conceive, if we recollect the prophecies delivered by Iſaiah and himſelf againſt them all, eſpecially againſt the Edomites; whoſe unbrotherly conduct to the Jews at the captures of Jeruſalem ſeems to have greatly affected them, and is therefore often mentioned very pathetically in the Pſalms and elſewhere in Scripture: the completion of which prophecies, "by the Edomites being at laſt ſerved as they have ſerved us," would doubtleſs bring his argument more home to the Jews in future times, whoſe benefit he might conſult by the *compilation* of his book, as much as he did by the *delivery* that of the Jews, who were then living. But if any

qua ſubacta bellum geſſit contra Ammonitas & Moabitas. *Joſeph. Ant. lib.* 10. 11.

one

one ſhould rather think, that in the two laſt examples concerning the Edomites and Sidonians, their fates are rather there predicted in the 12th year prophetically *, than added hiſtorically afterwards; this will no way affect the chief point in view, namely, that the two or three firſt mentioned examples concerning the Aſſyrians, Perſians, and Scythians, are certainly related hiſtorically as paſt events at the time of *delivery*; which therefore ſufficiently indicate the ſame *argumentative* arrangement here in this chapter, as in ſome preceding ones.

I have then only to enquire farther concerning the events, referred to here, relative to Elam, Meſhech, and Tubal; that concerning Aſſyria having as certainly happened *before* the date of delivery, as thoſe concerning Edom and Sidon did *after* it, the only ones in any doubt are the above three. Now the prophane hiſtories of theſe times having all periſhed, we can only pick up a few fragments to aſcertain theſe events in queſtion; which is a defect ariſing from the broken nature of profane hiſtory, not from

* Enumeratio fit duarum monarchiarum, quæ *jam ceciderant* quatuor verſibus, tum aliorum populorum, qui prophetice *caſuri* prædicantur quinque verſibus. *Tremell.*

theſe prophecies conſiſting of broken fragments. In regard to Elam it appears from Jeremiah that the invaſion of this nation by Nebuchadnezzar, was certainly *after* the acceſſion of Zedekiah, yet it was *before* the end of his reign, both becauſe the armies of Nebuchadnezzar were after this event employed in ſouthern expeditions againſt Tyre and Egypt, againſt the Ammonites and Moabites; and alſo becauſe Herodotus plainly intimates, that Cyaxares, *after* the expulſion of the Scythians, reduced all the nations, who had at his defeat by the Scythians revolted from him (among which Perſia was probably one) and that this happened *before* the capture of Niniveh, which is mentioned as the very lateſt event in his reign*: therefore the reduction of Elam muſt have happened *between* the acceſſion of Zedekiah and his 4th year; conſequently it was a *paſt* event at the *delivery* of this prophecy in the 12th year. In like manner we have reaſon to conclude that the event referred to concerning Meſhech and Tubal was a *paſt* one alſo, and that it was no other than the well known expulſion of the Scythians from Media by Cyaxares, as

* See note to p. 193.

Jackſon

Jackſon has already rightly obſerved (vol. 1. 363), altho' he has erroneouſly placed this action after the capture of Niniveh. Others, indeed, have run into very extravagant conceits concerning the completion of this prophecy againſt the Scythians: Lowth, for inſtance, explains it prophetically concerning the irruption of the Turks and Tartars into Aſia, which overturned the Greek empire; outdoing in this the conceit of Symmachus and Theodotion, who had before explained it prophetically alſo of an army of Heretics, that is, of Chriſtians, during the Greek empire *; but that it referred hiſtorically to a paſt event, and that this was the above-mentioned expulſion of the Scythians appears by one circumſtance, mentioned in the 27th verſe, which has not (I think) been noticed by any writer. Herodotus informs us, that Cyaxares maſtered thoſe invaders by inviting them to an entertainment, and making them drunk, on which he ſlew them †; now to this the

* Hieron. ad Locum.

† Horum potiorem partem Cyaxares & Medi hoſpitio acceptam inebriatam que interemerunt; & ſic quidem Medi recuperarunt imperium, *receptis iis quibus prius potiebantur*, & Ninum expugnaverunt. *lib.* 1.

prophet ſeems to refer in theſe words, "They ſhall not lie with the mighty, which are gone down to hell with their weapons of war, and have laid their ſwords under their heads, but their iniquities ſhall be on their bones." The commentators have rightly obſerved, that it was the cuſtom of thoſe times for warriors to be buried with their arms, which Iſaiah calls *lying in glory*, xiv, 18; but they have not ſuggeſted any reaſon why the Scythians alone ſhould be here deprived of the uſual military honor; which, however, the account of their diſgraceful expulſion in Herodotus ſufficiently explains, and hereby identifies this expulſion and the conſequent invaſion of Scythia to have been the real events referred to by the prophet. Still farther, that Nebuchadnezzar had aſſiſted Cyaxares in this invaſion of Scythia, and in placing Egyptian colonies there, appears by extracts from Megaſthenes in Euſebius and

Hence alſo we have reaſon to conclude, that he means the Perſians among thoſe *receptis*; conſeqnently this event preceded or accompanied the capture of Niniveh; which we find here mentioned as the laſt event in the reign of Cyaxares. Perſia had been conquered by Phraortes, father to Cyaxares, and probably had revolted, when the latter was defeated by the Scythians.

Joſe-

Joſephus *, which mention an expedition of Nebuchad. againſt Iberia near the Euxine ſea; where accordingly we know from various ancient authors, that Scythian nations of the names of Moſchi and Tubareni continued down to Grecian and Roman times, together with others called Gogi, and mentioned afterwards.

Hitherto then we have diſcovered no

* Μεγασθενης δε εν τη τεταρτη των Ινδικων αποφαινειν πειρατα τυτον τον βασιλεα τη ανδρεια ὑπερβεβηκοτα τον Ηρακλεα, κατασρεψασθαι γαρ αυτον φησι Λιβυης την πολιν [πολλην] και Ιβηριαν. *Joſeph, Antiq. lib.* 10. Μεγασθενης δε φησι Ναβυκοδοσορον Ηρακλεος αλκιμωτερον γεγονοτα επι τε Λιβυην και Ιβηριην σρατευσαι, ταυτας δε χειρωσαμενον, απο δασμον αυτεων εις τα δεξια τυ Ποντου κατοικισαι. *Euſeb.* 9. It is wonderful that Jerome in referring to Joſephus for this fact ſhould conceive him to mean Spain by Iberia (not. *c.* 38.) The Aſiatic Iberia was doubtleſs meant by Megaſthenes as Scaliger has juſtly obſerved, "De Iberia dubitemus, niſi ſit Iberia ad partes Euxini Ponti; quod quidem ſequentia probant, in quibus dicitur *devictarum nationum colonias ad dexteriora Ponti deportatas*, not. in Fragment. Agreeably to this Strabo places *Gogarena* near the river Cyrus, and Iberia and Colchos, lib. 11. And Herodotus alſo takes notice, that in his travels he found remains of a colony of Egyptians near Colchos, as he deduces from their practice of circumciſion; which however he erroneouſly ſuppoſes to have been placed there by the fabulous Seſoſtris; they were more probably deſcendants of the Egyptian colony planted by Nebuchadnezzar, as Megaſthenes here teſtifies.

want

want of connexion nor diſorderly arrangement; and when the prophet had thus *confirmed* his predictions of evil both to the Jews and Heathens by exemplifications of the like predictions already fulfilled among the latter, he proceeds to apply home the concluſion ariſing hence by an expoſtulation and pathetic addreſs to the hearts and conſciences of the Jews, as contained in the 33d chap. telling them "That it is his duty, as a watchman to the ſtate, to warn the wicked from his way (ver. 8.), that if he does not turn from his way, he ſhall in like manner, as has been foretold, die in his iniquity (ver. 9.) but that there are ſtill hopes the Jews may avoid their fate thro' God's mercy, who has no pleaſure in the death of the wicked, but that he ſhould rather turn from his way and live: turn ye then, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die, O houſe of Iſrael (ver. 11.), God will certainly judge *every one* after his ways (ver. 20.)." Thus ends this addreſs and application to the Jews of the foregoing *prophecies* and *hiſtory* of their accompliſhment among the Heathens. But to what Jews is this addreſs directed? To the Jews who were already in captivity; in order then that this addreſs might make the

ſtronger

ſtronger impreſſion on them and produce its wiſhed-for effect, he immediately ſubjoins an information, which he repreſents as having been juſt then received, of the actual capture and deſtruction of the city of Jeruſalem, agreeably to his foregoing prophecies againſt it *: the accompliſhment of which prediction againſt the Jews themſelves, joined to his hiſtoric narrations before of the accompliſhment of many others againſt the Heathens, both *complete* his *arguments* in favour of the credit and veracity of his predictions againſt Egypt or other nations, and alſo prove by a conſpicuous example the truth of that maxim, with which he had concluded his late addreſs to the captive Jews, "That God will judge every one after his ways," both Jews and Heathens.

Thus end the prophecies of Ezechiel againſt the *City* of Jeruſalem with a ſubjoined *hiſtoric narration* of their actual accompliſhment; but he ſtill continues his prophetic cares and foreſight toward thoſe who ſurvived this deſolation, both thoſe

* "And it came to paſs in the 12th year of *our* captivity in the 10th month, in the 5th day of the month, that one that had eſcaped out of Jeruſalem came unto me, ſaying, the city is ſmitten." xxxiii. 21.

who

who continued in Judea, and alſo the captives elſewhere: his viſions partly of calamity to theſe likewiſe, and partly of future comfort were *delivered* immediately after the receipt of the above ill news, and therefore the order of *delivery* with reſpect to the following predictions may unite in ſome degree with the order of *hiſtoric accompliſhment*; and hereby form a brief ſpecimen of that, which I arranged as the *ſecond* ſpecies of method, tho' the firſt in point of utility.

I have a few remarks to make on the date of Ezechiel's firſt news of the capture of Jeruſalem; which I ſhall reſerve for a ſeparate *diſſert.* but whatever that date may mean, *viz.* whether Ezechiel intended to aſſert, that in the 10th month of the 12th year he *firſt* heard the news of the capture of Jeruſalem (as Jerome and all others ſeem to underſtand him) or whether he meant no more, than that ſome of thoſe, who had eſcaped, *then* happened to mention this event in his hearing (a ſenſe, which, I think, his words will bear) yet in any caſe the reaſon of his introducing this *hiſtoric narration* is evidently the ſame as upon ſeveral former occaſions, namely, by a recital of this conſpicuous completion of his former prophecies againſt the Jews, to gain

better

better credit to the belief of ſome farther predictions, which he is going to deliver againſt the Jews likewiſe, that is, againſt thoſe who had been permitted to remain in Judea after the captivity of the reſt; and of whom ſome falſe hopes ſeem to have been formed by the captive Jews, that this remnant would be ſtill able to preſerve the exiſtence of the Jewiſh ſtate in Paleſtine. *v.* 24. In oppoſition to theſe vain hopes Ezechiel proceeds immediately to iſſue out a prophecy "againſt thoſe that inhabit the waſtes of the land of Iſrael" * pronouncing that theſe alſo on account of their iniquity ſhould fall by the ſword, like the city of Je uſalem before: and he immediately adds the reaſon of his ſubjoining this farther prophecy; becauſe that notwithſtanding all the proofs, which he had brought before, from the *accompliſhment* of predictions iſſued by Iſaiah, himſelf and others againſt both Jews and Heathens, to confirm his prophetic veracity, yet "the *people* were ſtill talking againſt him by the walls and in the doors of the houſes, and tho' they came unto add heard his words, yet they would not no them, and his words were unto them only

* Chap. xxxiii. ver. 22.

as a pleaſant ſong", ver. 30. To remove therefore, if poſſible, this incredulity in the *people* of the Jews toward himſelf, and their apparent belief, that the Jewiſh ſtate would ſtill ſubſiſt in Judea under Gedeliah, he denounced an utter deſtruction of this remnant, adding, alſo "that when it ſhall *come to paſs*, then at laſt they will believe in him as a true prophet *." Here then at the concluſion of this viſion we find, that an appeal is made once more to facts, and in this caſe to a *future* completion of this prediction, juſt at the beginning of this viſion to the *paſt* completion of a former one againſt Jeruſalem: and we are here expreſſly informed at the ſame time concerning the motive of theſe appeals and *hiſtoric relations* of prophecies accompliſhed or to be accompliſhed, namely, that they were made in order to remove the incredulity of the *people*, and to confirm his prophetic veracity; which incredulity ſtill remaining, as we find here, even after the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, proves the propriety of his having ſo often before had recourſe to the ſame *argument* and proof of his own veracity.

* "When this *cometh to paſs* (ſo it will come) then ſhall they know, that a prophet hath been among them," *ver.* 33.

As

As the foregoing prophecy was directed againſt the *incredulity* of the *people*, ſo the following one is againſt the *ſelfiſhneſs* and avarice of their late *kings* and their *neglect* of government over the people "prophecy againſt the ſhepherds of Iſrael and ſay, Wo be to the ſhepherds, that do feed themſelves, ſhould not the ſhepherds feed the flock" *ch.* 34. 2. The negligence of the one being therefore pointed out as a cauſe of the incredulity of the other, the tranſition here is natural, and the connexion cloſe between this prophecy and the foregoing one; as alſo between the beginning of this prophecy and its concluſion: for hitherto we have ſeen nothing but predictions of evil and calamities; now for the firſt time here in the concluſion, we meet with predictions of mercy, comfort and deliverance; which are alſo introduced with great propriety and in a natural ſtrain of argumentation. For as neglect in the *ſhepherds* had been the cauſe firſt of incredulity, and then of calamities to the *people*; therefore tho' juſtice urged Ezechiel to declare before, "that God would judge every one according to the iniquity of his ways," yet conſidering that in part they ſuffered for the faults of their ſhepherds, mercy equally now urged

him to declare from God, " that he will judge between the fat cattle and the lean cattle, between the *kings* and the *people*; (ver. 20.) and becauſe it had been the former " who had puſhed all the diſeaſed with their horns, until they had ſcattered them abroad; therefore I will ſave the flock and they ſhall no more become a prey, and I will ſet up one ſhepherd over them, and he ſhall feed them, even my ſervant David (ver. 21. &c.), when I have delivered them out of the hand of thoſe, that ſerved themſelves of them, and they ſhall no more be a prey to the Heathen." (ver. 27.) Thus his long enumeration of evils predicted againſt Jews and Heathens concludes with a prophecy of comfort and deliverance to the captive Jews founded on good reaſons, why juſtice ſhould with reſpect to them give place at laſt to mercy.

But he goes on to ſhew, in the following prophecy (ch. 35.) that the ſame reaſon, which will operate in favor of the Jews, will not operate in favor of the Heathen, eſpecially not in favor of the Jew's relations the Edomites, the deſcendants of Eſau; for they ſhewed no mercy, and therefore deſerve to receive none, " and becauſe they have had a *perpetual* hatred, and

ſhed

ſhed the blood of the children of Iſrael in the time of their calamity—therefore blood ſhall purſue them, and I will make them a *perpetual* deſolation" (ver. 5. and 9.)

In like manner with reſpect to the *reſidue* of the Heathens *in general* he ſubjoins a ſimilar prophecy of deſolation to them, "becauſe they have made Iſrael deſolate---therefore thus ſaith the Lord, ſurely in the fire of my jealouſy have I ſpoken againſt the *reſidue* of the Heathen, and becauſe ye have borne the ſhame of the Heathen—ſurely the Heathen that are about you, they ſhall bear their ſhame," (ch. 36. ver. 3. and 7.) "they ſhall know, that I am the Lord." (ver. 36.)

The foregoing prophecy againſt the Heathens being in *general*, he proceeds in the next chap. (the 37th) to denounce prophecies againſt ſome of the *particular* Heathen nations, who ſhall thus ſuffer the predicted judgments; of theſe he mentions Gog and Magog, Meſhech and Tubal, Perſia, Ethiopia and Libya, Gomer and Togarmah: here it is obſervable, that among theſe no mention is made of the Medes or Babylonians; moreover by what events the above predictions were accompliſhed, is no eaſy matter to determine with certainty, becauſe

cauſe almoſt all the prophane accounts concerning thoſe times have periſhed. This, however, we may at leaſt determine, that interpreters have given way to a wanton extravagance of conjecture concerning this ſubject; and that the connected order of arrangement, which I have pointed out throughout Ezechiel has a fairer chance here of directing our conjectures right, than they were capable of before. Now as it is agreed, that Gog and Magog, Meſhech and Tubal mean different Scythian nations, ſome underſtand the prophecy againſt theſe nations to have been already fulfilled, namely, at that expulſion of the Scythians from Media by Cyaxares, related before in chap. xxxii. 26, but this cannot poſſibly be true, becauſe that event was paſt even before Ezechiel firſt began to prophecy. On the contrary, Symmachus and Theodotion have run into the other extreme; and here again as well as before, bring down to chriſtian times the accompliſhment of this prophecy againſt the Scythians; Lowth ſtill later, to the modern invaſions of Aſia by the Turks and Tartars: thus far, however, they ſeem to be right, that altho' what was ſaid of the Scythians in the 32d ch. was an *hiſtoric* recital of a paſt event, yet the ſubject of this

38th

38th is a *prophetic* one of ſome future invaſion; but in aſcertaining the time, when it happened, they have plainly indulged an extravagance of fancy, without conſulting what little internal evidence is contained in the prophecy itſelf, or what leſs has been preſerved by prophane authors. In that *diſſertation* abovementioned I may perhaps ſupply what theſe authors, and the other commentators have overlooked; at preſent I ſhall only obſerve in general, that tho' there is no date annexed by Ezechiel to fix the time of *delivery*, and few circumſtances to determine its *accompliſhment*; yet neither is there any internal evidence of its being an inſtance of diſorderly arrangement: it might have had its preſent place aſſigned to it, either becauſe it was *delivered* after the foregoing prophecies againſt the remnant of Judah and the Edomites, and that in favor of the return of the Jews in the 34th chapter, and thus may be placed according to the *order of delivery*; or elſe it might have been *accompliſhed* after the three foregoing events, and thus may follow the *order of hiſtory*: for we cannot pretend to have had accounts preſerved of all the irruptions of the Scythians into ſouthern Aſia; and it would be unreaſonable to draw an argument from

from our ignorance, againſt this prophecy's being arranged among the others agreeably to hiſtoric order. How unreaſonable this would be appears by the following fact; for not any one commentator has taken the leaſt notice of a great irruption of the Scythians, mentioned by Cteſias, and by him only, ſoon after the conqueſt of Media by Cyrus, and before his captures of Cræſus and Babylon *: this then might be the event predicted by Ezechiel, as it ſuits very well to the internal evidence and to the hiſtoric order of the concomitant prophecies; or there might have been ſtill other irruptions not noticed even by any prophane writer. There are, indeed, ſome reaſons to think, that the above-mentioned irruption was actually that in the view of Ezechiel, and conſequently that all theſe

* Narrat Cteſias Cyrum bellum Sacis intuliſſe, regemque ipſorum Amorgem, Sparethæ Reginæ Maritum cepiſſe: hanc ergo, marito capto, exercitum collegiſſe atque adverſum Cyrum bellum ſuſcepiſſe, eductiſque in Aciem virorum trecentis, mulierum ducentis millibus, Cyrum ſuperaſſe, & cum aliis plurimis Parmyſen fratrem Reginæ Cyri vivum cepiſſe ac ternos ejus liberos; horum autem cauſa poſtea Amorgem liberum dimiſſum, quod ipſi prius omnes liberati fuiſſent: & quod Cyrus, Amorge adjutus, adverſus Crœſum bellum ſuſcepit. *Excerp. Cteſiæ apud Photium.*

pro-

prophecies down from the 33d chapter, are placed according to hiſtoric order: hence it would follow once more, that the prophet muſt have either ſurvived all theſe events, by his being able to arrange them thus agreeably to hiſtory, or that he muſt have acted under ſupernatural influence; and in fact it was not more than 55 years from the 5th of Zedekiah, when Ezechiel began to prophecy, unto the capture of Babylon. But ſtill farther, if it ſhould not appear to others, that this prophecy againſt the Scythians is placed either according to the order of *delivery*, or that of *hiſtory*; yet that there is no inſtance here of diſorderly arrangement may be maintained upon another principle; for it may be contended, that it is placed in *argumentative* order. For the 34th chapter contains the firſt *general* predictions of mercy and deliverance to the Jews; the 35th and 36th on the contrary farther predictions of deſolation to their conquerors and oppreſſors the Edomites and Heathens in general: the 37th, farther confirmations of deliverance and reſtitution to the Jews, but ſtill only in *general* terms: then follows in the 38th, and 39th, that againſt the Scythians, which is in fact at the ſame time a prophecy of a *particular* mercy to the Jews, the firſt real act of their deliverance, and a

prelude to that more complete one by Cyrus from Babylon, predicted in almoſt as minute a manner as if it had been recited, and contained in the 40th and eight remaining chapters. If then that prophecy againſt the Scythians was *accompliſhed* at their irruption mentioned by Cteſias, ſoon after Cyrus's acceſſion; it's completion would become an *argument* of the ſame nature as before, viz. of the veracity of that concluding and moſt important prediction concerning the final reſtoration of Judah from their captivity at Babylon, effected about 20 years afterwards *: for altho' indeed no expreſs

* Æſchylus has put this proof of prophetic veracity, ſo often uſed by Ezechiel, into the mouth of Prometheus, which ſhews how natural and convincing a proof it has ever appeared to men.

Προμ. Το παν πορειας ηδε τερμ' ακηκοεν.
Οπως δ' αν ειδη μη ματην κλυουσα με
Α πριν μολειν δευρ', εκμεμοχθηκε, φρασω,
Τεκμηριον τετ' αυδα δυς μυθων εμων.

Prom. vinct. lin. 822.

If we ſuppoſe Prometheus to mean (as he plainly does) that he attained his knowledge of *paſt* events, not in the human way of hiſtory, but thro' his ſupernatural power; then this proof, which he gives Iö of the veracity of his predictions to her of *future* things, by propoſing to inform her of all *paſt* events, becomes a ſimilar proof to that of Ezechiel, tho' not exactly the ſame.

Her [*future*] wandrings has ſhe now fully heard:
That ſhe may know ſhe has not heard in vain,
Her labors *paſſed* e'er theſe rude rocks ſhe reached,

Will

mention is made of Babylon, yet that Ezechiel had this in view appears from his mentioning the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin among thoſe, who were to be delivered (chap. 48.) That this prophecy, if thus fulfilled againſt the Scythians was the firſt *particular* act of deliverance to the Jews appears plain; for they are repreſented as intending to over-run Judea, but as being deſtroyed in the attempt *; and that this prophecy was not *delivered*, or at leaſt not *accompliſhed* until after the acceſſion of Cyrus,

> Will I *recite*, good *argument* that truth
> Stamps my predictions ſure———
> Proving the præſcience of my mind, that ſees
> More than appears. *Potter's Tranſl.*

By having thus recourſe to a Pagan, I only mean to illuſtrate how natural this proof is to all men: I can better appeal to the Chriſtian Scriptures for the propriety and ſolidity of the proof. "Jeſus ſaid to the woman of Samaria, thou haſt well ſaid, I have no huſband; for thou haſt had five huſbands, and he whom thou now haſt is not thy huſband; in that ſaidſt thou truly. The woman anſwered, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet—and ſhe went her way into the city and ſaid to the men; come, ſee a man, who told me all things that *ever I did*, is not this the Chriſt?" *John* iv. 17.

* When Gog ſhall come againſt the land of Iſrael, ſaith the Lord, my fury ſhall come up in my face—and I will call for a ſword againſt him—and I will plead againſt him with peſtilence and with blood, &c." 48, 18.

we may collect from the mention made of *Perſia* in ver. 5. without the leaſt mention of the *Median* kingdom; this looks as if the latter was *then* extinct by Cyrus's conqueſt of it, and *Perſia* become the ruling power: agreeably to this there is intimation alſo, that the Jews had *then* in part at leaſt returned from captivity *, which could ſcarcely be before the acceſſion of Cyrus; and they are deſcribed moreover as "all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates," ver. 11. Theſe circumſtances then are equally unſuitable to the opinion of thoſe who fix this event either long *before* or long *after* the time of Cyrus: and analogy in arrangement urges us to conclude, that it was nearly *about* that time; or at leaſt that there is no proof, nor even indication of ſuch diſorder, here any more than elſewhere, as can juſtify the aſſertion, that this prophetic book conſiſts only of fragments, put together at random by ſome later collector than the author himſelf: but rather that the whole appears throughout to be arranged with ſo much

* Thou [Gog] ſhalt come into the land that is brought back from the ſword, and is gathered out of many people, againſt the mountains of Iſrael; which have been always waſte; but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they ſhall dwell ſafely all of them, ver. 8.

order,

order, obvious connexion and oratorical argumentation, that one may juſt as well ſuppoſe the words, writ on a Sibyll's leaves and ſcattered by the winds, capable of falling by mere accident into ſufficient order to form an epic poem; or that the atoms of Epicurus could by a fortuitous concourſe form the univerſe, as that theſe prophetic expoſtulations ſhould have followed each other in ſuch a cloſely connected manner thro' mere accident in collection. Now it has been the oppoſite opinion to this, namely the ſuppoſition of a total diſorder prevailing throughout, which has chiefly contributed to explode a belief formerly received among Chriſtians, that divine inſpiration extended to every article of compoſition in the prophetic books; for ſuch a diſorder ſeemed to many to render the arrangement unworthy of being aſcribed to divine agency: but this reaſon will now ſubſide, ſince I have proved, that in reality the imputed fact of diſorder is not true; conſequently the former belief concerning the greater extent of inſpiration in this book may be now ſafely recalled again; even altho' the connexion and arrangement ſhould ſtill not appear ſuperior, nor yet equal to the beſt human compoſitions. For no one demands perfection in writing as a neceſ-

neceſſary concomitant of inſpiration even in the New Teſtament, either in regard to the language, conceptions, compariſons, arguments or philoſophy, why then in regard to arrangement here; and why not rather with reſpect to every article of compoſition ſuch a degree of perfection only, as ſhall be fit and ſuitable to the characters of the perſons who ſpeak, or the audience who hear, or the work to be brought about by the delivery? A ſufficiency of fitneſs and propriety with reſpect to the end in view is in this caſe a not leſs intereſting perfection, than the ſummit of logical argumentation, oratorical eloquence, or poetic ſublimity, in the opinion of either proteſtant or popiſh doctors *. As Secker thought fitneſs of manner to the hearers alone a very ſufficient recommendation in an inſpired work; ſo Simon thought the ſame of fitneſs in manner to the ſpeakers only; otherwiſe he could have never judged it a ſufficient plea in the prophecies of the paſtoral Amos, that he employed compariſons concerning lions and ſuch other animals, becauſe he had been

* "The authors of the New Teſtament, had they been maſters of the moſt elegant Greek, would have acted wiſely in preferring to it that vulgar kind, which the perſons to whom they wrote ordinarily, uſed and underſtood better." *Secker's Serm.* 3.

bred

bred among them in the foreſts; without having any regard, whether his hearers had been alſo bred to the flock, or to the camp, or the court *. But which ever may be the moſt juſt plea, the exploded opinion, of an *univerſal* inſpiration prevailing throughout the prophetic books, becomes now not only more defenſible but even neceſſary to all perſons, who ſhall not be inclined to adopt the alternative opinion; namely, that theſe metrical prophecies, for the purpoſe of religious and political exhortation, were not *compiled* into one work and put together in their preſent form by Ezechiel, until after many or moſt of the events predicted there had actually happened; notwithſtanding that they had been *delivered* ſeparately many years before: either of theſe opinions ſeem admiſſible, but which was the real fact muſt be left to each perſons own judgment; and either of them is preferable to the cavils of freethinkers on the one hand againſt the

* Jeremie ayant eſtè elevè à la Campagne parmi les paiſans avoit un ſtyle bas & ſimple: ce que n' empeche pas, qu'il n'ait eu le meſme eſprit de prophetie, que les autres, qui ont eſtè plus eloquens qui lui. C'eſt auſſi pour la meſme raiſon que le prophete Amos ſe ſert des comparaiſons priſes des lyons & d'autres animaux parce qu'il avoit eſtè elevè dans les foreſts parmi ces ſorts de beſtes. *Hiſt. crit.* c. 4.

reality

reality of the prophecies under a falſe pretence of diſorder, or to the ſuppoſition of commentators on the other to account for that diſorder by means of *Fragments* and *Additions*; which opinion leſſens the originality and authenticity of the proteſtant rule of faith, more than it contributes to ſupport the reality of the prophecies: ſo that at preſent between freethinkers and commentators we are intangled in a ſtreight as between Scylla and Charybdis; from which diſtreſs however we are relieved by either of the opinions, which I have proved from the preceding analyſis of Ezechiel, to follow as neceſſary conſequences of the preſent form and connexion between the ſeveral parts of his work; and we have no reaſon to think, that they were ever *compiled* in any other form. Whereas on the contrary in the caſe of the *Caſſandra* of Lycophron, the only ſpecimen of the oracular poems of prophane antiquity, which the ravages of time have ſpared; even the *compoſition* alſo as well as *compilation* of the predictions recorded there, were both of them certainly long poſterior to the times, when the hiſtoric events took place. Upon the whole then we find, that the Jewiſh prophets were members, if I may be allowed

lowed the expreſſion, of the *oppoſition*, which ſubſiſted in thoſe days, and they figured among the leading patriots of their country; who took very free, yet neceſſary liberties in criticiſing and condemning the meaſures of their kings, nobles, prieſts and people, both in their private and public capacities; and how unwelcome ſoever any facts they might foretell, yet they employed ſufficient arguments, and had ſufficient *indicia divinæ potentiæ* to convince all parties who did not obſtinately reſiſt conviction, that the events they foretold would certainly arrive: theſe temporary and occaſional harangues delivered at different times, yet all tending nearly to the ſame purport, as "Did I not tell you this before? and did I not tell you true?" were afterwards combined by their reſpective authors into one continued metrical oration of admonition; and entered as *proteſts*, to be preſerved for the inſtruction of ſucceeding ages, concerning the obſtinacy of kings and the infatuation of the people, notwithſtanding all the ſigns of the times. By ſuch means they have accordingly been preſerved; and they appear in arrangement and connexion ſufficiently fit and ſuitable to their propoſed end in view, conſequently not leſs worthy in theſe points of being inſpired, than in any other articles of compoſition.

A new Syſtem of Chronology during the Times of the Jewiſh Prophets.

Olymp	Æra of Nab.	K. of Babyl.	K. of Judah.	K. of Media	Median K of Niniv.	Hiſtoric Events.
	Before 118	1. Beleſis.	—	—	1 Arbaces.	Arbaces the Mede, aſſiſted by the Medes, and Beleſis the Babylonian, deſtroyed the firſt Aſſyrian kingdom at Niniveh, ending with Sardanapalus, according to Cteſias, Polyhiſtor, and Agathias.
	111	—	—	—	—	The ſame according to Syncellus.
	94	—	—	—	—	The ſame according to the computation of Paterculus.
	76	—	—	—	—	Jereboam, ſon of Joaſh, K. of Iſrael, began to reign. Jonah propheſies againſt Niniveh, 2 K. 14. 25.
	72	—	—	—	—	K. of Niniveh deſtroyed in Euſebius.
	69	—	—	—	—	The ſame in Syncellus.
14¼	29	—	—	—	Pul.	
	1	Nabonaſſar.	—	—	—	With him began the celebrated Æra.
	20	—	—	—	Tiglah. Shalmanaſſar.	Tiglah Pileſer came againſt Pekah. He was now King, how long before is uncertain.
	24	—	1. Hezekiah *r.* 29.			
	27	Mardocempad.	4	—	—	He is the firſt K. of Babylon mentioned in Scripture.
	28	—	5	—	—	Shalman: takes Samaria at the end of this year.—Tobias born before this, and carried captive into Media.
	34	—	11	—	1. Sennacherib.	He acceded about this year.
	37	—	14	—	—	Sennach. invades Judæa and Egypt.
17¾	38	—	15	—	—	Iſaiah propheſies of the capture of Babylon by Aſſaradin.—Diodorus places Dejoces here 2 years too ſoon, owing to his fixing Cyrus's acceſſion 2 years too ſoon.
	39	Arkianus.	16			
18¼	40	—	17	—	1 Dejoces *r.* 53.	1 Aſſaradinus. The ſums of reigns in Herod. reckoned back from Cyrus, place Dejoces here, *r.* 54. in Euſeb. and Syncellus; who, together with Cteſias, *all* place Dejoces here.
	53	—	1 Manaſſeh *r.* 55.			
	60	Interreg. 8.	—	—	—	There ſeems to have been anarchy and rebellion at Babylon during theſe 8 years.
	68	Aſſaradinus.	—	—	29 —	Aſſaradin takes poſſeſſion of Babylon, which kingdom had been hitherto dependent on that at Nineveh, but were

Olymp	Æra of Nab.	K. of Babyl.	K. of Judah.	K. of Media	Median K. of Niniv.	Historic Events.
						were thus first united.—The prophecy of Isaiah fulfilled.
	74	—	22	—	—	Assaradin invades Palestine, besieges Azotus, and carries Mannasseh to Babylon.—About this time he brings captives from Cuth to dwell in Samaria.
	81	Saosduchinus.	—	—	1 Saosduchinus.	
1½	93	—	—	1 Ahraartes r. 24.	—	In Herodotus 22.
	94	—	—	*Aphraart.*	—	r. 24 in Euseb. 51 in Syncellus, yet in Euseb. his accession falls in this same Olympic year, as by the sums in Herod. and Ctesias. He first reduces Persia into subjection to the Medes.
	101	Chynila-dinus.	—		1 Chynila-dinus.	
	108	—	1 Amon r. 2.			
	110	—	1 Josiah r. 31.			
	115	15	—	1 *Cyaxares*, r. 40.	15 —	According to Herodotus and Ctesias, whose sums of reign down from Aphraartes agree, but not in Dejoces.
7½	117	17	—	1 Cyaxares	17 —	r. 38 only. —— This date the right one: for in Judith the death of Arphaxad [Aphraartes] K. of Media is placed in the 17th year of the King of Niniveh.
	118	18	—	*Cyaxar.*	18 —	32 in Eusebius.
	121	—	12	—	——	Josiah purges Judah from Idolatry.
	122	—	13	——	——	Jeremiah begins to prophecy.
	123	Nabopolasar.	14	—	1 Saracus.	Nabopolasar, general to Saracus rebels and makes himself K. of Babylon, whereby the two kingdoms were separated again.
9½	125	—	—	—	——	Alyattes accedes as K. of Lydia, r. 57. —War begins here between him and Cyaxares; for Herod. places it before the Scythian invasion.
	127	—	18	—	——	Josiah celebrates a great passover.
ca J	130	—	—	—	——	War ended between Cyaxares and Alyattes. In this year must have been the great solar eclipse mentioned in Herodotus. If any one would calculate it, it would decide as to the right year: no one has hitherto sought for it sooner than the 605th year before Chr. this is the 618th.
0¾	131	—	—	—	——	Cyaxares defeats the K. of Niniveh, and besieges the city, which he raises on the approach of a Scythian army, by whom he is defeated.—The Persians rebel.
2¼	137	—	—	—	——	Alyattes in Eusebius now accedes, to whom he gives only 49 years.
			31	—	——	Pharoah Necho invades Palestine, and kills Josiah probably in summer time.

Nebu-

Olymp	Æra of Nab.	K. of Babyl.	K. of Judah.	K. of Media.	Median K. of Niniv.	Historic Events.
	141	—	1 Jehoiakim. *r.* 11.			
	143	—	3 —	—	——	Nebuchad. as General to Nabopolaſſ. his father, invades Paleſtine, takes Jeruſalem, and carries Daniel and others captives to Babylon.
	144	Nabocolaſſarus.	4 —	——	— —	Nebuchad. becomes K. on the death of his father. In this year Alyattes did *ſome* memorable act referred to in the Parian Marbles.—Nebuchad. defeats Pharaoh Necho.
	145		—	*Cyaxares*, 32. *Sync.*		
	150	—	—	*Aſtyages.*	——	Aſtyages, 38 in Euſebius.
Captiv of Jehoia.	151	8 —	11 —	—	— —	Jeruſalem taken by Nebuchad. and Cyaxares, Jehoiakim ſlain, and his ſon carried captive to Babylon, the 3rd year inclusively, from the 13th of Joſiah.—1ſt Viſion of Ezech. in v. 1.
1	152	9 —	1 Zedekiah. *r.* 11.	—	— —	The 22d year of the Scythian invaſion of Media; they are now expelled by Cyaxares.—In this and the 3 following years, Perſia was recovered, Niniveh taken, Scythia invaded, and colonies of Egyptians placed near Colchos, the 30th year inclusively from the commencement of the new Babylonian kingdom by Nabopolaſſar; but if the reign of Zedekiah be reckoned from the *day* of his acceſſion in the preceding year, this will unite with the former computation, and the 1ſt of Zedekiah begin in the Julian year ſooner; the ſame also concerning Jehoiakim, if his reign be reckoned from the *death* of Joſiah (about Midſummer in the preceding year) as we ſhall find reaſon to think all Jewiſh reigns ought to be.
					End of the K. of Niniveh.	
4	155	—	4 —	1 Aſtyages. *r.* 35. Herod.	——	Cyaxares died in this year, whether he reigned 40 years or leſs,—the 11th year from the capture of Samaria; if then Tobias was born a year or two before, Niniveh might be taken a year or two ſooner.
5	156	—	5 —	—	——	Ezechiel's viſion in ver. 2. dated in this year—the 30th from the 18th of Joſiah.
11	162	19	11 —	——	——	Jeruſalem taken by Nebuchad. and the temple burnt in the 5th month.
12	163	20	—	—	— —	He begins the ſiege of Tyre.
	167	24	—	—	— —	He invades the Moabites and Ammonites in the 5th year after burning the temple.
24	175	32	—	—	— —	Old Tyre taken in this year the 13th of the ſiege, 3 years before the 27th of Jehoiakin's captivity.
	177	—	—	1 *Aſtyages.*		
27	178	35	—	*Sync.* 32.	— —	Nebuchad. probably about this time began to be mad; and the favor his ſon Evilmerodach ſhewed to the poor

of oia.	Æra of Nab.	K. of Babyl.	K. of Judah.	K. of Media.	Historic Events.
					ſoner Jehoiakin, preſented ſome proſpect of deliverance to the Jews.—Ezech. predicts it.
	182	—	—	—	1ſt year of Crœſus K. of Lydia; he could not
	187	Evilm.			accede later, therefore Alyattes not later than 125, but they might 1 or 2 years ſooner.
	188	—	—	*Cyrus.*	In Euſebius over Media. *r.* 30.
	190	—	—	1Cyrus	Over Media and Perſia. *r.* 29. according to Herod.
	192	—			and truth.
			—	3 —	About this time the Scythians invade Media, and
	193	Nabo-			defeat Cyrus in Cteſias.—In this year Crœſus
		nadius.	—		ſent to Delphi to conſult the oracle about his war
					againſt Cyrus, as pointed out by the Parian Marbles, (the 1ſt of 56th Olymp.) and he reigned only to the 3*d year* after, according to Herod.
	195	—	—	6 —	14th and laſt year of Crœſus, but if 3*d year* in Herod. is to be underſtood incluſively, he ended ſtill 1 year ſooner, and conſequently he and Alyattes commenced each 1 year ſooner.
	209	—	—	—	1 Cyrus, over Media and Babyl. in Syncel.
	210	1Cyrus	—	21 —	Cyrus defeats Nabonadius the laſt K. of Babylon.
	211	over	—	22 —	Takes Babylon.
	212	Babyl.	—	23 —	The Jews return from captivity.—70th from 3d. Je-
		Herod.			hoiakim.

Readers will perceive by this table, how neceſſary our *Reſearches* were before in order to fix the acceſſion of Cyrus rightly, and how in conſequence of this and of our adhering to prophane authorities only, and thoſe alſo of the beſt credit extant, all the ſuperior prophane events harmonize with each other and with ſcripture. Our farther inveſtigations and criticiſms on the proofs concerning all the preceding dates will appear afterwards; whence we ſhall find another confirmation of the antiquity and vulgar uſe of the Chaldæan æra: for it will be ſeen, that it has been the grand original of moſt of the different computations by the ancients, not only when they agree with truth, but even when they diſagree with it thro' the wrong apprehenſions many had conceived concerning the method of that æra, eſpecially in regard to Cyrus; whoſe diſtinct conqueſts of Media, of Crœſus, and of Babylon, by being confounded together as the ſame, have produced moſt of the great errors; and the different methods of beginning reigns of Kings, either at the new year before or after their acceſſion, moſt of the leſſer errors to be found in antiquity. Theſe errors of both kinds being thus detected and removed, we find in regard to principal events ſo many happy coincidences in the dates of different authors, that it is wonderful they ſhould have hitherto eſcaped the obſervation of chronologers.

CORRECTIONS in Vol. 2.

Page 43. line 5, *for* 81ſt, *read* 80th.
98. not. 2, lin. ult. *for* 554, *read* 454.
104. line 8, *for* Ezra, *read* Nehemiah.
125. line 9, *for* Iſrael, *read* Judah.

The Prophecies of Iſaiah vindicated from Diſorder.

HAVING vindicated the prophecies of Ezechiel from the imputation of being arranged without regard to any kind of order, we come now to what was propoſed before, that is, to apply the ſame three principles of vindication to Iſaiah; by which means, and by which alone we may be able perhaps to aſcertain, with greater preciſion than others, both the time when the predictions of this prophet were *delivered*, and alſo the events by which they were *accompliſhed*: for although Iſaiah is indeed more ſimple in his arrangement than either Jeremiah or Ezechiel; yet on the other hand, he has this greater diſadvantage, that he has leſs frequently marked the dates of delivery, and thereby has left us ſubject to greater uncertainty in regard to the hiſtoric events, which were the objects of his predictions. But as it is only to 5 or 6 of his firſt chapters, that either commentators have attributed, or the tranſlator hinted any diſorder in compilation; I ſhall therefore confine myſelf to theſe chiefly, although indeed his ſubſequent chapters have

alſo ſome occaſion both for illuſtration and perhaps vindication. At ſome future time, however, I purpoſe to purſue this inveſtigation of orderly arrangement in the prophets, and to extend it alſo to Jeremiah and the others: it muſt indeed be confeſſed, that the whole ſubject has at preſent been anticipated before its due place; for the prophane and Jewiſh chronology of thoſe times ought firſt of all to have been better aſcertained, before I advanced to ſhew how it harmonized with the prophetic and other ſcriptural books; but as I annexed in my laſt a brief ſketch of that new and amended ſyſtem of chronology, which I have in view to confirm by adequate proofs, and have even already introduced occaſionally ſome of thoſe proofs concerning ſome of the main pillars, on which this amended ſyſtem reſts; this may be ſufficient at preſent for thoſe, who would rather wiſh to ſee the harmonic effects, which my propoſed ſyſtem tends to produce, than the more direct proofs of its accuracy and ſolidity.

In regard to thoſe notes on Iſaiah by the learned tranſlator, which have or will come chiefly under our conſideration, they will be generally found to be of that kind, which he has not made the principal object of his

own

own attention; and which it is to be lamented that he did not, rather than have adopted the contents of thoſe notes from the opinions of preceding commentators; namely, ſuch as do not relate to the *literal ſenſe* of the text, ſo much as to the *deſign of the prophecy*, and the *hiſtoric events* connected with it *: for the latter ſubjects alſo will be ſometimes found neceſſary to aſcertain the *literal ſenſe* of the text, where dubious; and at other times to give it a more emphatic meaning and greater propriety: nay, the want of preciſion in the Hebrew language is ſo great, through the frequent omiſſion of the ſubſtantive verbs and other cauſes, that the mere Hebrew text itſelf cannot poſſibly determine in every inſtance, whether a prophet is ſpeaking of an event paſt, preſent, or future, whether he is relating hiſtories or announcing predictions; in which caſes the deficiency of the text can be only ſupplied, and its vagueneſs aſcertained by the general deſign of the context, and the hiſtoric circumſtances alluded to, compared with the date of delivery. The deſign therefore of the ſeveral prophecies,

* See the laſt paragraph of his Prelim. Diſſertation.

the hiſtory and chronology of the times become no inconſiderable articles toward determining the literal ſenſe of the text. Now in regard to theſe articles, it is not often indeed that the tranſlator differs from preceding commentators, yet ſometimes he does, and introduces new opinions of his own: but even when he does not, ſtill the very adoption of the opinions of others renders them ſo far at leaſt his own, that by means of the deference deſervedly paid in general to his ſelection and learned authority, they will doubtleſs obtain hereafter better credit and currency, than they had before; and better perhaps than the weak foundation intitles them to, on which they were built by the firſt ſuggeſtors of them: in like manner many errors have taken ſuch deep root through the approbation of his illuſtrious predeceſſors Uſher and Prideaux, as criticiſm has never ſince been able to eradicate; and this alſo attended with the additional diſadvantage, that more juſt opinions had been before their time propoſed by older authors, although they ſelected, tranſmitted, and have eſtabliſhed worſe *. It is then

* To ſeveral examples of this, which I have had occaſion to point out, I may now add that hint for determining

then the notes of the tranſlator on ſuch ſubjects chiefly, which I have had occaſion to criticize, whenever I found their authority to ſtand in the way of my vindication of the prophets from the pretended want of order and originality: ſuch ſubjects are indeed the moſt important of all in ſacred criticiſm, and this to ſo great a degree, that the public would wiſh to have found, and has perhaps been partly diſappointed at not finding more new and enlarged diſcuſſions in his annotations concerning theſe capital articles, rather than concerning the meaning of particular words. Every critical correction however has its uſe; but whether his alterations can be deemed ſuch improvements, as to render this ſupplement unneceſſary, in order to complete what he has

determining the true date of the capture of Babylon, which I have attributed at v. 1. p. 229, as having been revived (1737) by Vignoles only after Scaliger: this I ſince find to have been properly urged by Strauchius in his *Breviar. Chron. lib.* 4. *c.* 24. *ap. fin.* yet Prideaux, tho' he quotes Strauchius, adhered to the erroneous ſyſtem of Uſher, which has continued ever ſince in public favour. But I have always endeavoured to recover and do juſtice to the meritorious hints of more antient authors, which have been too often neglected and trodden under foot by the weight of favourite authority and the undiſtinguiſhing currency of public eſteem.

omitted

omitted, and to remove the confuſion which others had produced, muſt be left to the public judgment. If in the execution of my propoſed taſk, I have ſuggeſted many novelties, it is not from my being tainted with the preſent rage for novelty and ſyſtem, but from the averſion I had to digeſt monſtrous inconſiſtencies, as being reaſonable ſolutions of difficulties and ambiguities, however authorized ſuch ſolutions may have been by long or learned preſcription: the neceſſary conſequence was a conviction, that the prophets could never be extricated from the preſent maze of incoherence, by following the beaten road of former commentators. It has been alſo a too common practice with them to deſert a reader at the very brink of difficulty, and where their guidance is moſt wanted, to ſhrink back from the danger, and leave their readers to plunge on by themſelves; but I have as much diſdained the latter as the former practice, and have never failed to ſet my ſhoulder ſtrenuouſly to the work: ſo that many things may ſeem novelties, chiefly becauſe none have hitherto given us their thoughts in ſuch an ingenuous manner concerning points of difficulty. Upon the whole, I have endeavoured to trace out to intelligent readers, what idea

every

every rational man (neither warped by philoſophic ſcepticiſm, nor by the dogmatiſm of received opinions) may and ought to form concerning theſe extraordinary and ſingular compoſitions by the Jewiſh prophets; which contain ſufficiently clear predictions of all the great events and revolutions in Aſia during ſeveral centuries; which to hiſtoric accuracy and poetic effuſions add alſo the farther claim of being the oracles of God; and theſe pretenſions they ſupport in ſuch a forcible manner, as to carry a high degree of perſuaſion and conviction along with them. If therefore they have been loaded with any difficulties not their own, and involved in confuſion and inconſiſtency, by the pretended explications of expoſitors, what can be more agreeable to critics or more advantageous to chriſtianity, than to find, that by a few corrections in the ſuppoſed dates, chronology of the times, and hiſtoric accompliſhment of thoſe predictions, this confuſion will be removed, thoſe difficulties will be ſurmounted, and a reaſonable order of argumentative expoſtulation will ariſe out of ſuch an irregular jumble of hiſtory, poetry, and prophecy, as has diſguſted ſome candid chriſtians, and diſtreſſed all: but which, when thus reduced to a properly connected arrangement, will diſarm ſcepticiſm of ſome

of

of its beſt weapons, and theſe borrowed chiefly from the inconſiderate and ill-founded ſuppoſitions and conceſſions of chriſtian commentators themſelves.

Such being the *general* tendency of theſe enquiries, let us examine how far it will be promoted and confirmed by our vindication of Iſaiah in particular, from the diſorder imputed to him by his commentators and tranſlator. Now as his firſt prophecy, which has any date annexed, is that in the 6th ch. a difficulty has ariſen in determining the time of delivery of the preceding 5 chapters, whether it was *before* the 6th or *after* it; and this muſt be our firſt ſubject of examination: in which, after having pointed out the opinion of the older commentators, and the alteration made by later ones, we ſhall conſider whether the tranſlator has made any improvement on them in this reſpect, and alſo ſhew what farther improvement may be ſtill made toward removing this difficulty, and fixing the time of their delivery. And inſtead of theſe 5 chapters being delivered, as according to the old commentators *before* the 6th chapter, or according to later ones *after* it and under Ahaz, or according to the tranſlator partly before and partly after, but *all before* Ahaz; we ſhall on the contrary find reaſon to con-

conclude, that they were *all* delivered *after* that in the 6th chapter, and *after* Ahaz, and even *after* the 6th year of Hezekiah: which is a later date than has been ever hitherto aſſigned to them; but one which introduces an order and conſiſtency into the arrangement of the whole, that is otherwiſe wanting, notwithſtanding any former amendments by other commentators, and moſt of all wanting under thoſe alterations propoſed by the tranſlator.

As no dates are annexed to theſe 5 chapters, it is only by internal evidence contained in them, that their time of delivery can be fixed; accordingly to this all commentators have had recourſe; but whether they have repreſented it in a juſt light, is the point in doubt. Jerom was of opinion, that theſe 5 chapters were delivered under Uzziah, and that all Iſaiah's prophecies are arranged agreeably to the order of their *delivery* *.

* Quod in titulo ponitur, prophetaſſe Ezaiam ſub Oſia, et Joatham et Achaz et Ezechia regibus Juda, non ut in aliis prophetis *confuſe* intelligendum eſt, ut neſciamus quid ſub quo ſpecialiter rege dictum ſit, ſed *uſque ad finem* voluminis ſcriptum referatur, quid ſeorſum ſub Ozia, et quid ſub Joatham, et quid ſub Achaz, et quid ſub Ezechia ei a domino *revelatum ſit*. *Comm.* c. 1.——Mortuo Oſia, ſub quo dicta univerſa, quæ *ſupra* expoſuimus, &c. *Comm.* c. 6.

Our older commentators, Tremellius, Gataker, and others adopted the ſame opinion, even Lowth apparently at firſt among the reſt *: and the internal evidence, which they have produced to confirm this opinion, is chiefly from the 7th verſe of chap. 1. †.

* "We ſhall make great confuſion and diſorder in the prophetical writings, if we ſuppoſe them to break off abruptly from the matter in hand, and without any viſible tranſition go to a quite different ſubject; and this is very unreaſonable to ſuppoſe in Iſaiah, who as he is moſt eminent for the clearneſs of his prophecies concerning Meſſias, ſo he is as remarkable for the regular order and contexture of his prophecies, and their coherence one with another." *Lowth's Vindication of the Inſpiration of the Old and New Teſtament*, 1699, p. 135. Nevertheleſs in his *Comm. on Iſaiah*, (1714) he is inclined to place the delivery of theſe 5 chapters *after* the 6th chapter, which is contradicting the above remark. "This was probably [not] the firſt viſion, which Iſaiah had, but is placed at the beginning of his book, becauſe this and the 4 following chapters contain a general deſcription of the ſtate of the Jews under the ſeveral judgments which God had brought upon them, and are a fit preface and introduction to the reſt," *Note* 1. *ch.* 1. *Not* is omitted by accident in the 1ſt edition; and Lowth does not determine whether the delivery was *before* or *after* Ahaz."

† "Your country (*is*) deſolate, your cities (*are*) burnt with fire; your land, ſtrangers devour it in your preſence, and (*it is*) deſolate as overthrown by ſtrangers."

The

The omiſſion of the ſubſtantive verbs here in the Hebrew has made ſome doubt, whether Iſaiah is prophecying of *future* deſolations, or relating an account of ſuch as were then *paſt*: and even if they were not omitted, yet the doubt might be ſtill the ſame; becauſe all the prophets often ſpeak of future calamities in that figure of anticipation, as if they were already arrived and preſent before one's eyes. Accordingly Jerom underſtands theſe and all other expreſſions of calamity in theſe 5 chapters, to be altogether prophetic of the Babyloniſh captivity, and even of ſtill later deſolations. On the contrary, the above commentators conſider them as *hiſtoric* notices of paſt misfortunes fallen upon the Jews not long before: which if right, yet gives riſe to another doubt concerning what particular calamities he had in view. Thoſe older commentators, having adopted Jerom's opinion, that theſe 5 chapters were *delivered* under Uzziah, and before the 6th dated in Uzziah's laſt year, in courſe ſuppoſed the calamities in his view to have been the paſt civil wars between Judah and Iſrael under Amaziah father to Uzziah, or elſe the Syrian invaſion by Hazael in a ſtill more early reign *; and in

* Hazael rex Syriæ temporibus Joaſhi, et Joaſh rex Iſraelis temporibus Amaziæ: neque tantum externis

truth there is nothing in the 7th verſe or elſewhere, which can determine, whether the calamities referred to had paſſed 20 years before or only one: by this method theſe 5 chapters would have preceded the 6th in delivery; conſequently hereby theſe and the following chapters would be all arranged in a regular manner agreeably to the *order of the delivery*. But againſt this order of arrangement our later commentators have urged a weighty objection; for the 6th chapter (they ſay) contains ſtrong marks of being the *firſt* deſignation of Iſaiah to the prophetic office; conſequently the 5 preceding chapters muſt have been *delivered after* the 6th. This objection Tremellius and Gataker foreſaw, and endeavoured to obviate it by denying the viſion in the 6th to have been Iſaiah's *primary* deſignation, and by conſidering it as only a renewal or confirmation of his prophetic office, ſuch

ternis bellis, ſed etiam inteſtinis motibus ab ipſis domeſticis attrita eſt, idque tam graviter *quam fuiſſent facturi* extranei. *Trem. c. 1. v. 7.* This ſenſe of, *as if overthrown by ſtrangers*, may perhaps render the tranſlator's conjectural emendation of the text unneceſſary; more eſpecially ſince he himſelf proves in his Prelim. Diſſert. that tautology is an eſſential principle of Hebrew poetry.

as occurs (they pretend) often in Ezekiel* ; but if this were really true (which cannot well be allowed) yet an objection would ſtill remain ; for thus the *primary* deſignation of Iſaiah has not been preſerved at all ; which would countenance the opinion of *fragments*, and that Iſaiah himſelf was not the *compiler* ; now this ought to be proved and not merely ſuppoſed. In order therefore to get rid of theſe difficulties, later commentators found themſelves forced to abandon the opinion of Jerom and Tremellius, and to acknowledge, that theſe five chapters muſt have been delivered *after* the ſixth : but here again they have differed ; for ſome with Le Clerc ſuppoſe the ſeventh verſe to be a prediction of the *future* calamity of civil war under Ahaz, and delivered *before* it ; while others conceive it to have been delivered indeed under Ahaz but *after* theſe wars, and to be an hiſtoric mention of their *paſt* effects † ; either of which two opi-

* " This doth not appear to be ſo much a general miſſion, as a ſpecial commiſſion for a particular meſſage, that he was at this time to deliver. So Ezechiel ch. 8. and 11." *Gatak.* 6. 8.——See Tremellius in note to page 235."

" † Moſt underſtand this of ſuch waſte as has already been made by the Syrians and others joining with the Iſraelites, under Ahaz. *Gatak. c.* 1. *v.* 7.

nions

nions breaks in upon the regular order of delivery. Lowth rather concurs with Le Clerc, that this verſe is predictive of ſomething *future*; but, while the others agree in ſuppoſing all theſe five chapters to have been delivered at the ſame time, or in the ſame reign, the tranſlator is the firſt (I think) who contends, that part of theſe five chapters was delivered in one reign, and part in another; and even the four laſt chapters *before* the firſt; which interrupts the order of delivery ſtill more, and indeed introduces unneceſſary confuſion*. By this relation then it appears, that hitherto there is no preſcription in favour of any one method of expoſition; and that, although later commentators have continually been deviating from the opinions of former ones, yet they have introduced as many difficulties one way, as they removed in another; and that the internal evidence in the ſeventh verſe, to which alone they have all appealed, is too ambiguous to enable them to arrive at any thing certain and determinate. It will therefore appear the leſs exceptionable, that

" * Chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, ſeem by internal marks, to be antecedent to ch. 1; they ſuit the time of Uzziah, or the former part of Jotham's reign; whereas ch. 1. can hardly be earlier than the laſt years of Jotham." *Note, ch.* 6, *v.* 1.

I ſhould

I ſhould differ from all the others, and place the delivery of all theſe five chapters about ſix or eight years later than any one has hitherto done, namely, *after* the captivity of the ten tribes, and the deſtruction of Samaria, in the ſixth year of Hezekiah: now this, as we ſhall find, will be attended with no other interruption of the order of delivery, than may be juſtified, as in Ezekiel, by ſome or other of our three principles of vindication; which points we will next proceed to prove.

That the prophecy in the ſixth chapter was Iſaiah's *primary* deſignation to the prophetic office, is the firſt article to be conſidered. Now this ſtrongly appears from his own expreſs words, as moſt interpreters have acknowledged; Lowth ſcarce admits a doubt of it; and the doubts, which Tremellius and Gataker have ſuggeſted, ſeem to have been raiſed merely, becauſe it otherwiſe preſented an objection to the early date of delivery, which they had aſſigned to the preceding five firſt chapters; and this date, as well as their doubts, they have ſupported by too ſlight evidence*. For the examples which

" * Non hic *primum* Eſaias vocatur ad prophetandi unus, ſed *denuo* confirmatur propter gravitatem ſequentis

which they bring from Ezekiel, are not parallel ones; becauſe in Iſaiah there is no reference to any prior deſignation, and there could have been none prior, unleſs it be loſt; which is begging the queſtion: whereas in Ezechiel, whenever he has any ſubſequent deſignation, he expreſsly refers to his primary one, as being the pattern of the reſt*. Moreover, as the two other chief Prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, in relating their primary deſignation, mention its being accompanied with uncommon ſupernatural repreſentations; analogy renders it probable, that this was alſo the primary deſignation of Iſaiah, ſince it was thus attended with the like extraordinary appearances. Still farther, it is not true, that any greater *gravitas* is diſcoverable in this prediction, than in the preceding five chapters, neither with reſpect to the greatneſs of the deſolation denounced, nor yet with reſpect to the great mercy diſplayed in the reſtoration of the remnant:

quentis prophetiæ, ne perſpectis difficultatibus animum abjiceret, ut Ezechieli perſæpe factum eſt." *Trem. c.* 6. *v.* 7. See *Gatak. ch.* 6. *v.* 8. whoſe reaſon againſt this being the primary deſignation, is ſtill weaker. See alſo Tranſlat. *c.* 6. *n.* 1.

* " Behold the glory of the Lord was there, according to the *viſion, which I ſaw* in the plain." 8. 4. —" And the viſions were like the *viſion that I ſaw* by the river Chebar," 43. 3.

but

but this at leaſt is diſcoverable, that the prophecy here in the ſixth chapter, is more *brief* and *general*, than in ſome of the preceding five chapters, which are again rather marks of its being the firſt viſion, than otherwiſe. For in like manner, the nineteen firſt chapters of Jeremiah, and the fifteen firſt chapters of Ezechiel, are ſo very *general*, that any man, without the ſpirit of prophecy, might venture to predict the ſame calamities to every nation upon earth, as certainly as death to every individual: but when the completion of thoſe predictions approached very near, then we find more and more *particular* circumſtances revealed; which help to decide concerning the nation, which ſhould inflict the calamity denounced, the time when, or the manner how it was to be brought about. So in this ſixth of Iſaiah, he deals in *general* terms only; whereas in the concluſion of the fifth, he adds ſeveral *particular* circumſtances, which point out the Aſſyrian invaſion expreſsly, as I ſhall ſhew; conſequently there is reaſon again to preſume by analogy, that the fifth was delivered after the ſixth. I have already indicated in Ezekiel other ſimilar examples of a *ſhort* or *general* prediction being prefixed often to the more minute and *particular* ones; which is indeed no more than what orderly arrangement and propri-

ety require. Another inſtance of the ſame occurs in the 45th of Jeremiah; where before he advances to denounce calamities upon *particular* Heathen nations in Paleſtine, he prefaces the whole with both a *brief* and *general* prophecy againſt the *whole land* concerning *the evil to be brought upon all fleſh*: order therefore, as well as analogy, unite in claiming the ſame conduct from Iſaiah here; for ſuch brief and general predictions are like *general* titles to the *particular* contents of chapters. Laſtly, in the thirteenth verſe of chapter ſixth, there ſeems to be a ſtrong prediction of the deſtruction of the *ten* tribes, wrapped up and prefigured (in the common manner of the Jews and Orientals) in the myſtery of a ſacred number; for by the *tenth*, the *ſacred* tythe number Iſaiah ſeems to allude to the future deſtruction of the *ten* tribes, and that only a *tenth* part nearly (viz. Judah and Benjamin) ſhould be preſerved*. That this was the object of the prophecy, may be confirmed from Amos, who had before Iſaiah prefigured the ſame event in the ſame manner, "Thus ſaith the Lord, the city, that went out by a thouſand, ſhall leave an hundred, and that which went forth by an hundred, ſhall leave ten to the houſe

"* Yet in it ſhall be a tenth, and it ſhall return." vi. 13. See Tranſlat. *v.* 6. *n.* 13.

of

of Iſrael." v. 3. Iſaiah's prophecy therefore, here, was at leaſt no ſuch new one, as to require any ſpecial commiſſion, or ſecond deſignation to be granted him (as Gataker and Tremellius pretended); nay, he ſeems to refer expreſsly to the above prior prediction of Amos in thoſe words, "Hear ye indeed, but underſtand not, &c." ver. 9. But in chapter 5th he appears to refer to this expreſſion of the *tenth* as to a prophecy which had been actually *accompliſhed* before the delivery of the fifth chapter: for addreſſing himſelf to the men of Judah and Jeruſalem *only*, (v. 3.) he reminds them of the completion of his former prophecy concerning only the *tenth* to be preſerved, "In mine ears, ſaid the Lord, (viz. in that former prediction contained in chapter vi.) ten acres of vineyard ſhall yield one bath, and the ſeed of an homer ſhall yield an ephah. 9." He had expreſsly informed us, that by the vineyard he meant the people of Iſrael (v. 7.); now both a bath and an ephah were only a *tenth* of an homer; and from the completion of this his former prophecy, he urges the neceſſity of amendment in Judah; for becauſe this had been neglected in Iſrael, "Therefore (he adds) my people [are] gone into captivity;" meaning the *ten* tribes are already carried away, as I predicted. This indicates, that the fifth chapter was not delivered

until *after* that event: the participle in the Hebrew, *gone*, ſtrictly means a paſt event; yet may leave us in ſome doubt, whether he is ſpeaking of an event which *has been*, or *ſhall be*; hence Le Clerc renders it in the future, *migrabit*: but as the twenty-fifth verſe refers, confeſſedly by all, to ſome great *paſt* deſolations, this thirteenth *may*, and probably does the ſame; accordingly, the Septuagint, as well as the vulgate Latin and Engliſh underſtand it of a *paſt captivity*, [αιχμαλωσις εγενηθη]; which ſenſe will afterwards appear more ſtrongly confirmed by other internal evidence of the delivery of theſe five chapters *after* the captivity of the ten tribes. I ſhall only obſerve farther, concerning this laſt proof of the fact, that this ſhort prophetic intimation from the Lord, in the ears of Iſaiah, "That an homer of ſeed ſhould produce only a tenth part," ſeems to be thruſt in after a very abrupt manner, if it does not allude to that foregoing prophecy of the preſervation only of the *tenth*; but if otherwiſe, it acquires great force and propriety, eſpecially if that captivity of the ten tribes was then actually accompliſhed: for thus it becomes an *argumentative* confirmation, that his preſent prediction againſt *Judah*, *will be* compleated juſt as certainly, as that foregoing one againſt the *ten* tribes of *Iſrael has been* compleated already;

already; of which argument I have produced ſeveral examples before in all the Prophets.

There being then great reaſon to conceive, that the ſixth chapter contains Iſaiah's *firſt* viſion and *primary* deſignation to the prophetic office, let us attend to what other reaſons may be ſuggeſted for the delivery of theſe five chapters *after* the captivity of the ten tribes. The *ſecond* and this a conſiderable proof is, that throughout all the five firſt chapters, there is not the leaſt indication of the kingdom of Iſrael being then exiſting. Now Hoſea, Amos, and Micah, in thoſe prophecies delivered during the exiſtence of the kingdom of Iſrael, give continual proof of it in almoſt every verſe, and indeed lay the burthen very heavy upon the ſhoulders of their brother Ephraim: but after the firſt or ſecond chapter Micah becomes as totally ſilent concerning Ephraim and Samaria, as Iſaiah in theſe five chapters; both of them directing their addreſſes and invectives to Judah only, or Zion, Benjamin or Jeruſalem; from ſuch a very different conduct, may we not reaſonably infer, that there was then a very extraordinary difference in the ſtate of things? And what ſhould this difference be, except in the ceſſation of the kingdom of Iſrael *before* thoſe remaining prophecies were delivered?

This

This event Micah, as well as Iſaiah muſt have probably lived to ſee, ſince the titles inform us, that they both propheſied under Hezekiah; nay, Jeremiah expreſſly proves, that the third chapter of Micah was not delivered until the reign of Hezekiah*: from the total ſilence then in that and all the following chapters concerning Samaria, we may reaſonably preſume alſo, that the third chapter and the reſt were not delivered until after the deſtruction of Samaria in the ſixth of Hezekiah. From the like ſilence of Iſaiah in theſe five chapters, the like concluſion ſeems to follow; more eſpecially as Iſaiah himſelf alſo in thoſe propheſies certainly delivered *before* the captivity of the ten tribes, is as replete as the other Prophets with ſuch alluſions to them, as in almoſt every verſe, prove the kingdom of Iſrael to have been then ſtill in being†. In regard to his addreſs to the people by the name *Iſrael*, (in *v.* 3. *ch.* i.) this was a generic title, as well as *Jacob*, given by all the Prophets to the whole Jewiſh people, thoſe of

"* Micah, the Moraſthite, propheſied in the days of Hezekiah, to all the people of Judah, ſaying, Sion ſhall be ploughed like a field, and Jeruſalem ſhall become heaps, &c." xxvi. 18. This prediction is in the third chapter of Micah.

† See chapters 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 17.

Judah

Judah as well as Iſrael; accordingly, in Micah that paſſage quoted by Jeremiah and ſaid by him to be directed to *the people of Judah*, is really in Micah addreſſed to *the people of Iſrael and Jacob*; and, although Jeremiah and Ezekiel do ſometimes diſtinguiſh the two kingdoms by the names *Iſrael* and *Judah*, as well as the hiſtoric books, yet at other times they likewiſe uſe Iſrael as a generic title, to include Judah as well as the diſperſed tribes of Iſrael.* The moſt uſual names in the Prophets for the kingdom of Iſrael, are Ephraim and Samaria: So that nothing can be concluded here from this title *Iſrael* either way. But there are ſeveral other paſſages in theſe chapters, which, although they may indeed refer to other calamities, yet may alſo be as reaſonably underſtood to mean the deſolation of the ten tribes; and may ſerve to prove, that although Iſaiah is ſilent here concerning the exiſtence of Samaria, yet he is not ſilent concerning its deſtruction. I have pointed out one paſſage in the fifth chapter: again in the firſt he alſo ſays, "Why ſhould ye be ſtricken any more—your country is deſolate, your cities are burnt with fire; your land ſtrangers devour it in your preſence—

* Jerem. xxx. 3 and 4. xxxi. 31. Ezek. iv. 4 and 5. viii. 3 and 6. &c.

and

and the daughter of Sion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, &c." These words are addreſſed to *Iſrael* in general, that is, to all the poſterity of Jacob, and they are indeed ſuch general expreſſions of calamity, as are equally adapted to every invaſion; but for this very reaſon, why ſhould they be rather appropriated to the calamities under Amaziah or Ahaz, than to thoſe under Hezekiah? and why again be thought better ſuited to the calamities of Judah than to thoſe of Samaria? But at leaſt this expreſſion "Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard," acquires a greater force and propriety, if conſidered as a pathetic lamentation for the deſtruction of the ten tribes, the chief part of that Jewiſh ſtate; which is ſo often repreſented under the idea of a vineyard, as hereby Zion was left almoſt alone: and finally, that every other lamentation throughout, ſhould be for the widowed ſtate or ſins of Judah, Zion, and Jeruſalem, without even a ſingle ſigh or thought either of grief or invective beſtowed upon the ſins of their brother Ephraim; this alſo ſeems to betray again the non-exiſtence of the latter kingdom.

A *third* proof may perhaps be derived from the prophecy, which Iſaiah in his ſecond chapter quotes from Micah. The contrary has indeed been affirmed by all commentators,

tors, and by the tranſlator alſo *, namely, that it was Micah, who rather quoted this from Iſaiah: but I can find no author, who vouchſafes to give us any ſufficient proof of this aſſertion. They ſeem to have followed each other implicitly, and all to have borrowed the hint of their only proof from Jerom †; which however is in reality no proof of the fact at all: for ſince I have ſhewn that Iſaiah's firſt viſion was no earlier than in the laſt year of Uzziah, the titles can prove nothing more, than that Micah and Iſaiah were cotemporaries. But at leaſt the tranſlator and thoſe commentators can not conſiſtently urge any ſuch proof from the titles, who doubt concerning the originality of the title to Iſaiah, and who may equally extend that doubt to the title of Micah: ſo that the opinion of the tranſlator is indeed what he juſtly calls it, a mere *ſuppoſition*, without ſome better evidence; and I know of none except ſuch as

* "The prophet Micah has repeated this prophecy in the ſame words, with little or hardly any material variation: for as he did not begin to prophecy till Jotham's time, and this ſeems to be one of the firſt of Iſaiah's prophecies, I *ſuppoſe* Micah to have taken it thence." *ch.* 2. *n.* 2.

† Eſaias ſub Oſia vaticinatus eſt; ex Titulo intelligimus Micheam Oſiæ temporibus non prophetaſſe, ſed filii ejus Joatham. *Comm. Mich. not.* 1.

can be deduced from internal evidence in the prophecy itſelf; but this, I apprehend, will appear to be entirely in favour of Micah containing the original and Iſaiah only the copy. For in Micah this prophecy is not only more complete both at beginning and end, but alſo the ſeveral parts more aptly connected together into one whole prophetic diſcourſe. Now copieſts are often abridgers, but ſeldom make additions, eſpecially not in a more connected manner than the original. The declaration that this denunciation came from God, which Iſaiah prefixes to the beginning, Micah has ſubjoined to the end *, and this is immediately preceded by thoſe words, for which the tranſlator compliments Micah, "as being both an improvement, and in point of imagery and expreſſion worthy even of the elegance of Iſaiah:" but this paſſage is entirely omitted in Iſaiah; if then Micah was the copieſt, he was alſo an interpolator, ſince his ſubſequent declaration proves, that theſe words are attributed by him to the original prophecy, whoſe ſoever it is. A ſimilar omiſſion occurs again in

* "And they ſhall ſit every man under his vine, and under his fig-tree, and none ſhall make them afraid.

"For the mouth of the Lord hath ſpoken it." iv. 4.

Iſaiah

Iſaiah at the beginning; we cannot indeed ſo accurately determine where this prophetic paſſage begins in Micah as where it ends: but I think every one muſt acknowledge, that the ſenſe as well as the conjunction *But* ſo connects it with the *laſt* verſe of the preceding chapter, as to render that *laſt* verſe a neceſſary member of the whole paſſage. For in Micah the prophecy in fact conſiſts of two parts; in the former of which he denounces a like deſolation to the *mountain of the houſe of the Lord*, as is conſpicuous *in the high places of the Foreſt*; and then he adds, *But afterwards* the directly contrary event ſhall take place, *and the mountain of the houſe of the Lord ſhall be eſtabliſhed in the top of mountains, and exalted above the hills.* Theſe two parts ſeem to be ſo aptly connected, and the denunciation againſt the *mountain* in the firſt part tallies ſo well to the future exaltation promiſed to the *mountain* in the latter part, as does not carry with it the appearance of an improvement by a copier, but rather of being the original; if we compare it with the abridged and mutilated ſtate of the paſſage in Iſaiah; who has again omitted all the firſt part, containing the denunciation againſt the *mountain*, and preſented the latter part in an abrupt manner, without ſuch a natural introduction: ſo that the prophecy

in Iſaiah ſeems to be in a crippled ſtate, both at beginning, middle and concluſion; juſt as if he had been the quoter of a piece only of Micah's prophecy, rather than that Micah had made additions to complete the deficiencies in Iſaiah. It may indeed be urged againſt this, that the concluding verſes of Iſaiah's 1ſt chapter contain in *ſubſtance* the ſame denunciation againſt Zion, as the firſt part of Micah's propheey: but ſtill the *expreſſions* do not tally ſo aptly to each other, and they are alſo disjointed from each other by the introduction of the declaration from the Lord in the 1ſt verſe: ſo that they could have never been intended to form a *whole* connected paſſage, as in Micah; but at leaſt they could not in the idea of thoſe, who with the tranſlator ſhall fix the delivery of the 2d chapter *before* the firſt. It may be obſerved moreover, that Iſaiah will be found in other paſſages afterwards quoting both Hoſea and Amos; and the ſubſtance even of his *primary* viſion (as I have obſerved already) is only a repetition of a prophecy in Amos concerning the preſervation of but a *tenth* of the Jews. If then it ſhall thus appear from internal evidence in this prophecy of Iſaiah in queſtion, that Micah is rather the original (and we are poſſeſſed of no other evidence) it follows, that ſince Jeremiah has proved this predic-

tion

tion even in Micah not to have been delivered until ſome time in the reign of Hezekiah, and probably, as I have ſhewn, not until his 6th year; by conſequence the 2d chapter in Iſaiah alſo could not have been delivered until *after* that year, therefore after the captivity of the ten tribes. By this deduction however, I mean no more than to conclude, that the authorities and *ſuppoſitions* in favor of the contrary opinion have no foundation to ſupport them; and that the identity of this paſſage in the two Prophets, if it contains any proof either way, rather conſpires with than contradicts the date, which I have aſſigned to the delivery of the 5 firſt chapters in Iſaiah, tho' *later* than what has been maintained by any other perſon.

A fourth proof may be deduced from the chief ſubject of Iſaiah's invective againſt Judah in the 1ſt chapter: the tranſlator has obſerved, that there are ſcarce any remonſtrances in it againſt Idolatry; this, although perhaps not altogether the real fact, yet is at leaſt thus far true, that the moſt conſpicuous part of the remonſtrance is againſt religious hypocriſy, againſt a claim to righteouſneſs on account of a punctual obſervance of all the inſtitutions of the Moſaic Law, while at the very ſame moment they neglected the weightier matters of the law,

law, juſtice, mercy and morality*. Such a cenſure could at no time be ſo ſuitable to the Jewiſh ſtate as about the 6th of Hezekiah; after he had during ſeveral years, and from the very 1ſt of his reign, introduced a ſtrict obſervance of the Moſaic Law: of this reformation the inhabitants of Judah might probably boaſt too much, and derive confidence from it, that on this account they ſhould eſcape the ſame calamity, as had befallen Samaria. But againſt this expectation Iſaiah pronounces a negative, and informs them, that notwithſtanding their outward garb of religion, yet as they were ſtill notoriouſly immoral in their practices, and perhaps alſo privately idolatrous; they muſt therefore expect to be firſt *purged from their droſs* by God's judgments, and that not until after this *Zion ſhould be called the city of righteouſneſs*. Such a remonſtrance againſt religious hypocriſy united with immorality and idolatry might doubtleſs be not unſuitable with the ſtate of Judah in other reigns: but hypocriſy could never be objected to it with ſo much propriety as under Hezekiah; in caſe Judah ſtill retained its former immorality and idolatry, notwithſtanding Hezekiah had revived all the Moſaic inſtitu-

* *Ch.* 1. *from v.* 10. *to* 23.

tions

tions more ſtrictly than any king before. The following circumſtances alſo may perhaps ſuggeſt a farther propriety in ſuch a remonſtrance *after* the deſtruction of Samaria in that reign: for Iſaiah's words are ſo very ſimilar to a prophecy concerning Iſrael in Amos, that he may be not improbably thought to have had Amos in his view; and to have intended here to apply to Judah that deſcription, which Amos had before given of the ſtate of things in Iſrael previous to its deſtruction; and thence to infer the impending deſolation of Judah, in like manner as ſuch an union of hypocriſy, immorality and idolatry had been *already* puniſhed in Iſrael by the Aſſyrian invaſion and their total extirpation*. That a like calamity

* "I hate, I deſpiſe your feaſt days, and I will not ſmell in your ſolemn aſſemblies. Though ye offer me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them, neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beaſts—but let judgment run down as waters, and righteouſneſs as a mighty ſtream." *Amos* v. 21.

"Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom, give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah—bring no more vain oblations, incenſe is an abomination unto me, the new moons and ſabbaths, the calling of aſſemblies I cannot away with, it is iniquity, even the ſolemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feaſts my ſoul hateth—when

lamity from the Aſſyrians ſhould in ſome degree extend alſo to Judah, is *ſlightly* indicated by Amos *; on this prior prediction then it might be the intention of Iſaiah to enlarge and to confirm it in a *more particular* manner, pointing out thence to Judah that their turn comes next, now that the prophecy of Amos againſt Iſrael for the like faults was actually *accompliſhed*. This prediction of Amos againſt Judah concerning an invaſion of it by the Aſſyrians is the earlieſt on this ſubject to be found in the prophets: for though the prophecies of Hoſea might poſſibly be prior, yet theſe are intirely directed againſt Iſrael; or elſe only in *general* terms againſt Judah, unleſs this kingdom

when ye ſpread forth your hands I will hide my eyes from you, yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear—learn to do well and ſeek judgment." *Iſaiah* i. 10. &c. The words, *Give ear unto the law of our God*, ſeem to be reference to ſome former prophecy, rather than the declaration of a new one now firſt communicated to Iſaiah.

* "Woe to them, that are at eaſe in Zion, and truſt in the mountain of Samaria," vi. 1. By a different ſenſe given to the Hebrew word rendered *at eaſe*, the Septuagint makes this ſentence alſo to be a prediction againſt Iſrael only: yet it is ſtill evident that Judah was included in this prediction of invaſion by the Aſſyrians; becauſe the laſt verſe declares, that it ſhould extend *to the river of the wilderneſs*; which (ſays Lowth) is the river of Egypt.

were

were included in the generic appellation *Iſrael*, which it probably was not in *this* prophet *. It can be no wonder then, that Iſaiah ſhould quote and refer to this ſlight *prior* prediction of Amos againſt Judah to be executed by the Aſſyrians; ſince it would ſerve to confirm the veracity of his own prophecies of the ſame calamity, juſt as Ezechiel afterwards appealed frequently to Iſaiah, and to the *other prophets of old* on the ſame account: and this practice of the prophets in thus teſtifying of each other was accordingly conſidered by the Jews as one conſiderable proof of the reality of their divine miſſion; of which traditionary opinion of the Jews no proof whatever would exiſt, unleſs ſuch ſimilar expreſſions in different prophets be conſidered as references to each other's *words*, for they ſcarcely ever refer to each other's *names*. Now if Iſaiah thus in his 1ſt chapter referred to Amos for a prior proof of the *calamities* to be inflicted on Judah, why might he not as well refer to Micah in the ſubſequent chapter for a prior proof of the future *reſtoration* of Judah; and ſo much the more, becauſe nothing on this latter ſubject is to be found in Amos relative to Judah in *particular*, and only a little at

* See Ch. i. 6, 7. Ch. xi—4. 15. Ch. xii. 2.

the concluſion even in *general* terms concerning any reſtoration at all to both nations in common. But at leaſt theſe circumſtances will tend to obviate any objection againſt this later date of the 5 chapters of Iſaiah in queſtion, under pretence that it tends to confuſion; ſince it thus appears, that it rather tends to produce harmony between different paſſages in the prophets; eſpecially if Iſaiah was later than Micah, of which there is no proof to the contrary: and ſhall we rather obſtinately adhere to received opinions and mere ſuppoſitions taken up at firſt without foundation, than give them up in order to make room for ſuch others as produce order, harmony, and conſiſtency? If every thing elſe be equal in point of probable ſuppoſition, the latter advantages ought to give the balance in favor of that ſuppoſition (even if it were nothing better than mere ſuppoſition) which tends to produce ſuch deſirable conſequences: a contrary conduct can be conſidered in no other light than as a blind reverence to the haſty and ill-digeſted commentaries of thoſe, who have happened to exiſt before us; without allowing to ourſelves the inherent and indefeaſible right of reaſon to make better ſuppoſitions, if we can, and to improve upon our anceſtors in this as in all

other

other caſes by the aid of time, conſideration and experience.

A fifth argument, that theſe 5 chapters were not delivered until after the acceſſion at leaſt of Hezekiah, and probably not until after his 6th year, may be deduced from the plain and *particular* prediction at the cloſe of the 5th chapter, concerning the Aſſyrian invaſion of Judah by Sennacherib. For tho' theſe 5 chapters are ſilent concerning any hints of *future* civil wars between Judah and Iſrael, ſuch as happened under Ahaz; and ſilent alſo concerning any ſuch *future* event as the deſtruction of Samaria; and ſilent even concerning the *preſent* exiſtence of Samaria as well as concerning any reproaches againſt it for its paſt or preſent conduct (which is not the caſe in the 10th chapter of Iſaiah, delivered likewiſe about Hezekiah's acceſſion, but *before* the deſtruction of Samaria*) yet theſe chapters are not ſilent concerning ſome ſtill *future* calamity to Judah (notwithſtanding thoſe *lately* paſt) and the concluſion of the 5th chapter plainly enough points out, that this *future* cala-

* "Are not my princes altogether kings—Is not Samaria as Damaſcus," *ch.* x. 9. See afterwards for reaſons why this chapter was delivered *before* the deſtruction of the kingdom of Samaria, but *after* the capture of Damaſcus.

mity in view was an Aſſyrian invaſion, conſequently it could be no other than that by Sennacherib, becauſe it was the firſt from Aſſyria which was directed againſt Judah. This laſt circumſtance then ſeems to concur with the foregoing ones in fixing the delivery of theſe chapters *after* the 6th of Hezekiah, but *before* his 14th year; in caſe we admit that the prophets ſuited their reproofs, exhortations and predictions of calamity with any degree of *propriety* to the circumſtances of the time, in which they were delivered; hereby the contents of each may often ſupply us with internal proofs to determine the date of each. From there being hints here of great *paſt* calamities to Judah, but no other ſtill *future* calamity to Judah plainly denounced in theſe chapters, except the invaſion of Sennacherib, may we not reaſonably conclude that the civil wars were paſt, and that theſe chapters were delivered in the interval between them and the Aſſyrian invaſion; and moreover from the total ſilence concerning Samaria, may we not as reaſonably bring down the date to be later in this interval than the deſtruction of that kingdom? The tranſlator himſelf allows the ſilence of Iſaiah in the 1ſt chapter concerning idolatry to be a ſufficient proof of its being delivered in a religious reign,

reign, and not in an idolatrous one *. Why then ſhould not the ſilence of Iſaiah in all theſe 5 chapters concerning any *future* civil wars, or concerning the exiſtence of Samaria be equally good proof of their not being delivered until after an end had been put to both. The ſame propriety which ſuggeſts the one concluſion, ſuggeſts the other, and ſuggeſts ſtill farther, that, ſince Iſaiah is not ſilent concerning an Aſſyrian invaſion being *ſtill future*, this was the *only* impending calamity, which was then *ſtill future* at the delivery of theſe chapters, and that the *paſt* deſolations to which he refers were thoſe in the civil wars of Ahaz and the deſtruction of Samaria.

Theſe arguments indeed from the *propriety* of the contents, in being ſuited to the times, may have no influence on thoſe, who are inclined to hug cloſe the current opinion, that all the prophecies contain nothing but a chaos of confuſion, deſtitute of reaſon and propriety in regard to the time of delivery, as well as of method in compilation;

* "The date of the prophecy in ch. i. is generally fixed to the time of Ahaz. But on the other hand it may be conſidered, whether thoſe inſtances of idolatry in *v.* 29. can be ſuppoſed the only ones, which the prophet would inſiſt upon in the time of Ahaz, who ſpread the groſſeſt idolatry through the whole country—I refer it then to Jotham's reign." *not.* 7.

as if it were incompatible with inſpiration for prophets to be ever influenced in their choice of either arguments or predictions by any of thoſe human motives and reaſonable conſiderations, which determine the conduct of the reſt of men in their expoſtulations and compoſitions: But this is begging the queſtion in debate; it is aſſuming a principle, which requires to be proved; for whatever proceeds from men, muſt be preſumed to be conducted more or leſs after the cuſtomary manner of men, until indubitable proofs have been produced to the contrary. What alteration inſpiration ought to make in human compoſition, is a point we are not able to determine from theory, nor otherwiſe than from the fact in theſe examples of the Jewiſh prophets; one ſhould preſume indeed it would be for the better rather than the worſe, at leaſt in point of fitneſs and propriety with reſpect to the general nature of man, the particular circumſtances of the times, and of the end in view by divine predictions. This matter of fact then requires to be minutely inveſtigated, whether any ſuch marks of rational conduct are or are not diſcoverable in theſe compoſitions; and all the authority of all the commentators added to the freethinkers, can never give credibility to a contrary preſumption

tion

tion until it can be made evident, that it is confirmed throughout by matter of fact: this preſumption of irrational diſorder and impropriety I have already diſproved by facts in Ezechiel; neither ſhall we find any more certain grounds for ſuch a preſumption in Iſaiah; but rather on the contrary, that the contents of each prophecy were here alſo ſuited with as much propriety to the time and circumſtances when it was delivered, as the whole body of prophecies were afterwards compiled together with plain marks of an intentional order and argumentation, ſuch as proves them to have been ſuperintended by the dictates of human reaſon at leaſt.

If no arguments are to be deduced from internal evidence in the contents, there is an end of all reaſoning; but if commentators do admit any argument drawn from conſiderations of propriety in the contents in any particular caſe, is it not inconſiſtent if they reject it in other caſes, where it is equally admiſſible; and if they have recourſe at their pleaſure, to their grand noſtrum, which like a panacæa, cures all diſorders, namely, that inſpiration abſorbs all conſiderations of prudence, propriety and human reaſon? Thus if a Jewiſh prophet ſhall ſeem to jumble together all predicted events in the utmoſt confuſion,

confuſion, the Babyloniſh captivity with the Syrian, Aſſyrian and others; and introduce the lateſt before the earlieſt, or make ſuch abrupt, disjointed, inverted and deſultory excurſions in his prophetic fury through the whole range of hiſtoric events within the ſpace of ſome centuries, *ut nec pes nec caput uni reddatur formæ*; can we think it a ſatisfactory ſalvo for this monſtrous production; if we affirm at one time (what we are totally ignorant of) that this is not the original production, as it came from the hands of the prophet, but of ſome careleſs collector; or if we affirm at another time, (in caſe it be imputable to the prophet himſelf) that God's ways are not as our ways, and that every gordian knot of difficulty may be thus cut aſunder, by reſolving all into our *ignoramus* of the incomprehenſible nature of divine councils? Does not ſuch a continual ſhifting of the ground, on which theſe reaſoners chooſe their ſtation, prove, that they feel themſelves upon a ſlippery and inſecure foundation; which makes them catch at any better one in view as ſoon as they find themſelves ſinking? This firmer foundation then, which they ſeem to wiſh for, it is my purpoſe to point out to them; for if the weakneſs of humanity dictates a diſtruſt of ourſelves in divine works,

does

does not cautious criticiſm equally dictate a diſtruſt of our own knowledge in productions of ſuch antiquity as theſe; in regard to which we are as ill qualified to judge of the human ſkill diſplayed in them, as we are of any operations by divine ſkill either in theſe or other inſtances? For we are ignorant of the very language of theſe compoſitions, ignorant of the hiſtory and circumſtances of the times, of the chronologic order of events; ignorant of what events were meant to be predicted, of the manners and cuſtoms alluded to, ignorant of the preciſe meaning of expreſſions when reduced to proſaic truth, which ſeem to us poetic hyperbole; ignorant even whether a prophet is ſpeaking of events paſt, preſent or future, ignorant of the cuſtomary ſtructure of compoſitions in that rude age, before they had been ſeparated into the ſeveral diſtinct ſpecies cultivated in Greece and Rome; and even ignorant whether they be writ in proſe or metre, and what the nature of their metre is; ignorant alſo, whether the perſons, who tranſcribed the prophecies out of their original Jewiſh character, whatever it was, into the preſent Chaldee character (in caſe this tradition be true) were ſufficiently qualified for ſuch a taſk; in ſhort, nearly as ignorant of the ſkill which may be

exerted in the human part of theſe works, as we can poſſibly be in any divine ones. Are there not here ſufficient human ſources of obſcurity, and a very ſufficient field for diſtruſt in ourſelves, and for excuſe to theſe works in caſe of any apparent difficulties; without reſolving thoſe difficulties, which perhaps only prove our own great ignorance, into inſtances of divine ſkill, and of the unfathomable nature of heavenly councils; as if obſcurity and confuſion were acceptable companions to inſpiration and prophecy, rather than unavoidable conſequences of our ignorance and of the incongruous as well as imperfect expoſitions of commentators? In this doubtful ſtate of darkneſs therefore, if we ſhall be often able happily to let in ſufficient light on ſome particular places, to diſcern the outlines of a regular conſiſtent plan of compoſition both in arrangement and argumentation; will not juſt criticiſm dictate to us ſtill more to ſuſpend our judgment concerning the leſs luminous parts, and rather to ſuſpect our own ignorance of ſome particulars neceſſary to clear up the whole, than raſhly to accuſe theſe works as poſſeſſed of ſo little order and connexion, that they could have never been compatible with the nature of human compoſition in any age of mankind? On the

contrary,

contrary, if we were to take a retroſpect of the nature of compoſition in the earlieſt ages, and of the various forms it has ſince undergone, together with a view of the condition, education, and literary acquirements of the Jewiſh prophets in the *ſchools of the prophets*, the academies and univerſities of thoſe times, where the prevailing literature of that age was cultivated; we ſhall neither find reaſon to conclude, that the prophets could be altogether deſtitute of conceptions concerning order and propriety; nor yet that theſe their productions are ſo deſtitute of thoſe advantages, as not to be venerable ſpecimens of the rude efforts of reaſon as well as genius in thoſe early ages of compoſition. The ideas of prophet and poet were ſo blended in antient times, that they mutually implied each other, and both had claims to inſpiration. Jamblicus informs us, moreover, that Bitys the prophet of Ammon, a king of Egypt, was, like Moſes, inſtructed in all the learning of the Egyptians, "for he was able to interpret the antient books of Hermes written in hieroglyphics and found in a temple at Sais †:"

† Ἡρμηνευσε δε Βιτυς προφητης Αμμωνι βασιλει ην Αδυτοις ιυρων αναγεγραμμενην εν ιερογλυφικοις γραμμασιν κατα Σαιν την εν Αιγυπτω. c. 5. *vit. Pythagor.*—Βιτυς εκ των Ερμαϊκων βιβλων μεθηρμηνευσεν. c. 7.

and St. Paul, making a quotation from a Greek poet, calls it a verſe taken from *a prophet of their own* *: Deborah alſo was a poeteſs as well as propheteſs, and an admired ſpecimen of her poetic talents has been preſerved in the ſong of Deborah. The Jewiſh prophets were an order of men totally diſtinct from either prieſts or civil Judges, although perhaps they were ſometimes united; they were often men of birth as well as education, and apparently in Judea as well as Egypt proficients in all the literature and liberal ſtudies which the age afforded: hence the prophet Amos, who was only a herdſman of Tekoa, takes care to inform us of this circumſtance in his title, as it was probably an extraordinary caſe; accordingly the adepts in the Hebrew language obſerve, that this fact is confirmed by his language, agreeably to the remark of Jerom, "that he was rude in ſpeech though not in knowledge." This view of the condition, education and ſtudies of the prophets leads us again to expect ſomething better in their productions than wild incoherent viſions, deſtitute of all order and propriety:

* "One of themſelves, a prophet of their own ſaid, The Cretians are always liars, evil beaſts, ſlow bellies. *Epiſt. Titus* i. 12.

neither

neither ought we to be ſurprized, if among the various modes of compoſition, which theſe curious ſpecimens of the literature cultivated in the ſchools of the prophets have tranſmitted to us, we ſhould find traces of that epiſodic manner, which Homer and epic poets afterwards retained; by introducing in the middle of their works a *narrative recital* of prophecies, which they had delivered in former times, together with a brief hiſtory of their actual accompliſhment. Theſe reaſons and critical examination have ſo thoroughly convinced me of the antiquity and originality of theſe inſpired compoſitions, and ſo opened my eyes to the rational ſtructure and conſiſtent plans of their authors, that I am inclined to become the myſtagogue to any others who may wiſh to be *epoptæ* alſo, and to gain ſuch a clear inſight into theſe myſteries of antiquity, as may extricate themſelves from that heavy load of mortality; through which too many are accuſtomed all their lives to be ever hearing, ſeeing and reading theſe ſacred books, without being either able or willing to underſtand them in a religious and chriſtian ſenſe, or indeed in any rational and conſiſtent one.

Such then being the nature of my proofs as to the date of delivery of theſe chapters, and ſuch being the general ſentiments with which

which critical enquirers into theſe ſubjects ought to be prepared, it only remains to aſcertain this fact, that the concluſion of the 5th chapter does actually contain ſufficient indications of its being a prediction of the Aſſyrian invaſion of Sennacherib and not of any other. Now here we have to differ again from the illuſtrious tranſlator, who, after Le Clerc and other commentators, ſuppoſes it to be a prediction of the Babylonian invaſion by Nebuchadnezzar, above a century afterwards *: this would deſtroy all idea of propriety in the contents, and of order in the predictions. Jerom brings down its completion to the ſtill later age of the Roman wars. Gataker thinks the Aſſyrian invaſion was meant, and Lowth ſeems in doubt between that and the Babylonian; but few of them vouchſafe to enter into any reaſons for their ſeveral opinions: they can therefore be conſidered in no better light than as mere opinions, and there is, we ſee, no preſcription in favour of any one. The tranſlator indeed does attempt one proof of his opinion; for he ſays, that "in *v.* 28. the prophet ſets forth the ſtrength and excellence of the Babyloniſh

* "Chapter 5 adds a more expreſs declaration of vengeance by the Babylonian invaſion." *not.* 1.

cavalry:"

cavalry*:" but this circumſtance is no more characteriſtic of a Babylonian army, than of an Egyptian or Aſſyrian one; all of them are equally celebrated in Scripture for cavalry and chariots†. Gataker has given a ſtronger proof of the Aſſyrian invaſion being meant, founded on propriety and order: "I incline rather to the Aſſyrian, becauſe as notable ſo near at hand, and it is not likely would be overſlipt—beſides that, like things are ſpoken afterwards to what here enſues, concerning the deſolation by the Aſſyrians to be effected." *ch.* vii. 26. The prophets always ſet forth as the object of their predictions, that thereby the people may be brought to repentance and amendment; this object would be always beſt

* "Their horſes hoofs ſhall be counted like flint, and their wheels like a whirl-wind." *ch.* v. 28.

† "She doted on the Aſſyrians her neighbours, captains and riders, all of them deſireable young men, horſemen riding on horſes. *Ezech.* xxiii. 6. and 12 and 23, "They ſhall ride upon horſes," viz. the Medes. *Jerem.* l. 42. Media was always famous for the breed of horſes, and ſupplied the Babylonians with them, as Strabo ſays. The Medes were, at this time, either allies or ſubjects to the Aſſyrian kingdom. Iſaiah himſelf, in ch. xxii. when deſcribing an *Aſſyrian invaſion*, whether that of Sennacherib or Eſarhaddon, ſays: "Elam bare the quiver with chariots of men and horſemen——thy choiceſt vallies ſhall be full of chariots and horſemen." *v.* 6.

fulfilled

fulfilled by the prediction of ſuch calamities, as would affect the living generation, and the ſooner the more forcibly; but calamities to poſterity above a century afterwards, few would concern themſelves about: why then ſhould we ſuppoſe, that a prophet would make choice of, and that inſpiration would ſuggeſt what is leaſt uſeful, until we meet with the moſt undoubted proofs of it? The Aſſyrian invaſion was within eight years after the fall of Samaria: and here we may obſerve concerning this argument of Gataker, as well as concerning a foregoing example in the tranſlator, and indeed concerning all commentators in their turns, how naturally in particular caſes they adopt this method of reaſoning upon the ground of propriety and rational human motives; ſo as to conclude, concerning what a prophet has done, from a view of what in the eye of human reaſon it was preſumable a rational man would do; this too, altho' at that very time they acknowledge him to be as much guided by inſpiration in theſe caſes as in any others. Is not this allowing, that inſpiration does not neceſſarily ſuperſede and counteract rational human views and motives of propriety? And if it does not in many particular caſes, how do we know, that it ever does? What we find

find compatible with inſpiration in the ſeveral parts, may be equally compatible with it in the whole; and thus if we ſhould diſcover that the argumentation in *every* prophecy was ſuited with propriety to the time, events, and circumſtances of each, paſt, preſent, and future; it can never follow from this, that it was the leſs inſpired, becauſe it thus bears marks of human art and reaſon being exerted in it: conſequently the converſe muſt be equally true, namely, becauſe we grant it to be inſpired, it does not follow, that for this reaſon we are to expect to find fewer traces and marks of human art, reaſon and prudential views in ſuiting the contents of any prophecy to the circumſtances of the time, when it was delivered; but on the contrary we ſhall hereby confirm the better its claim to inſpiration; for men naturally conceive, that the beſt human works approach the neareſt to divine. Nevertheleſs Huetius and Le Clerc argue, as if thoſe things muſt needs be moſt divine, which are the fartheſt removed from human art and reaſon; but this is in direct contradiction to the natural ſentiments of mankind: the moſt we can reaſonably allow is, that inſpiration may poſſibly be conſiſtant with very great degrees of human imperfection; ſo that neither the abſence

any more than the preſence of art, order, and propriety ſeem to contain any ſufficient marks, either of the preſence or abſence of inſpiration. The object therefore in my view by tracing out propriety in the contents of each prophecy, and a connected plan of arrangement in all of them, is not thereby to prove, that inſpiration does or does not extend either to their compoſition or compilation; but merely to aſcertain, whether there are not ſufficient traces of order and propriety to determine theſe works to be original, authentic compoſitions, put together by their reſpective authors conſiſtently with reaſon at leaſt; and neither a patchwork collection by different hands in accidental diſorder, nor yet intentionally in diſorder through the interference of inſpiration. Hereby indeed that proof of their inſpiration, ſuggeſted by Huetius and Le Clerc, will be ſet aſide, founded on the ſuppoſed very excellent diſorder in them, and the abſence of all ſuſpicion of human art and reaſon; but at the ſame time the objection of freethinkers will be hereby ſet aſide likewiſe, founded on theſe very ſame circumſtances; and the latter claſs may be more numerous than the former: nay in truth I am apt to think, that Huetius and Le Clerc themſelves would have never

adopted

adopted ſuch a ſtrange proof of inſpiration, except through mere deſpair of being ever able to diſcover any connected and reaſonable plan of arrangement or propriety in theſe compoſitions. Gataker's argument then ſtands upon a good foundation; and in confirmation of it I may obſerve farther, that the *bows and arrows*, attributed to the invaders in queſtion, ſeem to be characteriſtic of the *Aſſyrian army*, although cavalry is not *. That the Perſians were famous for archery is well known: Elam and Perſia were often in alliance with, and ſometimes ſubject to Aſſyria and Media, and are therefore often joined together in Scripture. Thus in *ch.* xxi. "Go up O Elam, beſiege O Media." *v.* 2. This was ſpoken of Eſarhaddon's expedition againſt Babylon. Again, in *ch.* xxii. which points out either Sennacherib's invaſion of Hezekiah, or as I rather preſume, Eſarhaddon's invaſion of Manaſſeh, we read, "Elam bare the quiver with chariots of men and horſemen." *v.* 6. Elam was here allied to Aſſyria, and the circumſtance of the *quiver* is expreſsly applied to theſe invaders. In Iſaiah's prophecy againſt Babylon, in *ch.* xiii. 18, *bows* are attributed to the Medes; but theſe

* "Whoſe arrows are ſharp, and their bows are bent." *v.* 28.

Medes were the allies of Eſarhaddon, who was himſelf of a Median race, although king of Aſſyria: accordingly Ptolomey's Canon, in the title, calls all that ſecond race of kings of Aſſyria, who reigned over Babylon after Eſarhaddon, by the name of *Medes* *. In *ch.* vii. *bows* and *arrows* are expreſsly aſcribed to the Aſſyrian invaders under Sennacherib †; and this is probably what Gataker meant, in part at leaſt, when he ſaid, "That like things are ſpoken afterwards concerning the Aſſyrian invaſion." Still farther, this explains more clearly what was meant by Iſaiah alſo in *v.* 18 ‡. That the *flie* is a characteriſtic emblem of the Edomites, Ethiopians, and other ſouthern nations, who are expoſed to ſwarms of locuſts, is acknowledged by the tranſlator and all others; but I have not obſerved, that any one has hint-

* Κανων Βασιλειων—Ασσυριων και Μηδων—Περσων Βασιλειων—Ελληνων. The races of Aſſyrians and Medes are here joined together; the race of Medes muſt have began with Aſſaradin, though the Canon does not keep them diſtinct: but the Perſian race is kept diſtinct, and begins with Cyrus, to whoſe name Περσων Βασιλειων is prefixed. The Medes, therefore, who reigned before Cyrus, muſt be the ſucceſſors of Eſarhaddon.

† "With arrows and with bows ſhall men come thither." *v.* 24.

‡ "The Lord ſhall hiſs for the flie, that is in uttermoſt part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee, that is in the land of Aſſyria." *v.* 18.

ed

ed at the reaſon, why the *bee* is there mentioned as emblematical of the Aſſyrians: it was probably on account of this circumſtance of the reſemblance between a *quiver full of arrows*, and the *forked ſting* in the tail of a bee; and if in thoſe early times the archers in their flight ſhot their arrows backward on their enemies, as the Perſians and Parthians did afterwards, the emblem would be ſtill more characteriſtic of the archers in the Aſſyrian army; whether they were native Aſſyrians, or Median and Perſian allies. Now that the Aſſyrian army ſhould be expreſſed by this emblem of a bee becomes again a ſtrong proof, that the circumſtance of archery was noticed as a *diſtinguiſhed* property, in that army; and thereby confirms, that the Aſſyrian invaſion was pointed out in the 5th chapter, not the Babylonian. It is moreover obſervable, that *expertneſs* in archery is never attributed in Scripture to the Babylonians, but to their enemies only. I have pointed out this already in the two prophecies againſt Babylon, in *ch.* xiii and xxi of Iſaiah: another proof occurs in Jeremiah's prophecy againſt Babylon by Cyrus in a later age; who again led the Medes, Perſians, and Aſſyrians againſt it, above one hundred years after Eſarhaddon; to whom archery is repeatedly attributed, but only

once

once to the Babylonians *. It may be ſtill urged perhaps by ſome, that not only this 5th chapter, but alſo the 2d and 3d are thought by the tranſlator and others to be prophetic of the captivity to Babylon: yet neither in theſe two chapters will there be found any better proofs of it, than in the 5th. For as to the circumſtances of deſolation, deſcribed in the 2d and 3d verſes, which the tranſlator thinks "to be clearly explained by the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar," *not.* 1; They are equally deſcriptive of every captivity, and of that under Sennacherib as much as any other. The firſt verſe does not confine this deſolation to Jeruſalem, but extends it to Judah in general: now, though Sennacherib did not take Jeruſalem, yet he made himſelf "maſ-

* "Lo, I will cauſe to come up againſt Babylon an aſſembly of great nations from the north—their arrows ſhall be as of a mighty expert man, none ſhall return in vain." l. 9, and 14 and 29. "They ſhall hold the bow and the lance, they are cruel and will not ſhew mercy, their voice ſhall roar like the ſea, and they ſhall ride upon horſes." 42. This is a ſimilar deſcription of the Medes, Aſſyrians and Perſians, to that in Iſaiah: it is once and only once ſaid of Babylon, "Every one of their bows is broken." *ch.* li. 56. The ſame phraſe is applied to Iſrael by Hoſea. i. 5. They might probably have ſome archers in all their armies, but *expertneſs* in archery is ſpoken of as characteriſtic of Perſia and it's allies.

ter

ter of all the fenced cities in Judah;" *Iſaiah* xxxvi. 1. and as to the facts mentioned in the firſt verſe concerning "the ſtay of bread and of water" being taken away, which many refer to the famine at Zedekiah's captivity, theſe are equally applicable alſo to the invaſion of Sennacherib. For we read in 2 *Chr.* xxxii. 3. "that Ezekiah ſtopt all the waters of the fountains and the brook, which ran through the land;" which probably as much diſtreſſed the city as Sennacherib; for the latter ſaid to the people, "doth not Hezekiah perſuade you to die by famine and thirſt?" *v.* 11. and the ſign given by Iſaiah xxxvii. 30. confirms that it was a time of ſcarcity, if not actually a Sabbatical year, in which the ground was never tilled. The words alſo in the 4th *v.* "I will make boys their princes," the tranſlator thinks "to have been fully accompliſhed in the ſucceſſion of weak and wicked princes from the death of Joſiah to the taking of Zedekiah:" but it is very doubtful, whether *princes* here mean *kings*, and not rather *nobles*, as it is often rendered; their *great men being but boys*, ſeems to be contraſted with *their being governed by women*, and to be only a general deſcription of national effeminacy ſuitable to every degenerate period, not particularly referable to any one. But

if

if we ſhould even grant, that *kings* are meant here, yet Jehoahaz ſucceſſor to Joſiah was 23 years old, when he began to reign; Jehoiakim 25, and Zedekiah 21, Jehoiakin alone was no more than 8, but in 2 K. it is ſaid 18: if then *boys* was meant literally, in the preceding period the religious kings Uzziah and Joſiah were only 16 and 8; Manaſſeh 12, and Amon 22; therefore this word ſuits beſt to this earlier period.

Thus far then we have advanced, namely, to aſcertain that if there be any ſufficient internal evidence contained in theſe chapters to determine the date of their delivery, and what invaſion was in view, it is all in favor of their being not delivered until after the capture of Samaria, in the 6th of Hezekiah, yet before the 14th, in which Sennacherib invaded Paleſtine with an Aſſyrian army. But ſince the tranſlator, inſtead of thus bringing down the date *later* than Ahaz, has on the contrary raiſed it up *earlier*, namely, to the reigns of Jotham or Uzziah, we ought to examine ſtill farther what reaſons he gives for this alteration. His chief reaſon is, that it may be doubted "whether thoſe inſtances of idolatry, which are urged in the 29th verſe of ch. i. (the worſhipping in groves and gardens, which was in all times but too commonly practiſed)

tiſed) can be ſuppoſed to be the only ones, which the prophet would inſiſt upon in the time of Ahaz, who ſpread the groſſeſt idolatry through the whole country, and introduced it even into the temple, and to complete his abominations, made his ſon to paſs through the fire to Moloch—I ſhould chooſe then to refer this prophecy to Jotham's time." *n.* 7. Now if we grant (what however may be denied) that the worſhipping in groves and high places is not ſufficiently characteriſtic of the idolatry current in the reign of Ahaz; yet, if according to the opinion of moſt other commentators the three prophecies contained in theſe five chapters were delivered in the ſame reign, there are very ſufficient reproofs againſt *all kinds* of idolatry in the 2d chapter, though not in the 1ſt, to be compatible with the reign of Ahaz, or any other idolatrous king. This circumſtance then affords no ſatisfactory proof for removing the date to another reign; eſpecially if we add, that in the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters, clearly delivered in the reign of Ahaz, there is ſcarcely any invective whatever againſt idolatry: why then ſhould we expect more in the 1ſt chapter? But, moreover, if we allow the utmoſt to this argument, yet it can only prove, that the 1ſt chapter was de-

livered in a more religious reign than that of Ahaz; and it might nevertheleſs be juſt as well in the *later* religious reign of Hezekiah as in the *earlier* one of Jotham. The above reaſoning is however obviated in part by the tranſlator, becauſe he places the 2d and following chapters in a different and earlier reign than the 1ſt; but the proof he gives for this alteration is as little ſufficient as his former one*: for although the port of Elath was loſt under Ahaz, and the Eaſt India commerce at an end; yet if the gold

* "The prophecy in the 2d ch. was probably delivered in the time of Jotham, or perhaps Uzziah, as Iſaiah is ſaid to have prophecied in his reign: to which time not any of his prophecies is ſo applicable as that of theſe chapters. The 7th *ver.* of *ch.* ii. and the latter part of *ch.* iii. plainly point out times in which riches abounded and luxury and delicacy prevailed. Plenty of gold and ſilver could only ariſe from their commerce, particularly from that part of it, which was carried on by the Red Sea. This circumſtance ſeems to confine the prophecy within the limits above mentioned, while the port of Elath was in their hands: it was loſt under Ahaz, and never recovered." *ch.* ii. *not.* 1. I now perceive, that the tranſlator is not ſingular in placing the 2d ch. before the 1ſt; Le Clerc was of the ſame opinion, but for a different reaſon; viz. he thought it inconſiſtent, that after the diſtreſſes of Judah under Ahaz in ch. 1, it ſhould in the 2d be ſaid to abound in riches. *Ch.* 2. *n.* 7.

and

and ſilver mentioned there had been acquired by that commerce, theſe precious metals would not be loſt immediately with the port of Elath; but might remain in circulation for twelve years after; and therefore this might be again as ſuitable to the *later* reign of Hezekiah as to the *earlier* one of Jotham. Still farther, if the contrary objection ſhould be made, namely, that the idolatry imputed to Judah in the 2d chapter is not compatible with the religious reign of Hezekiah, this muſt at leaſt be an inconſiſtent objection; for thus the idolatry mentioned in Iſaiah will be neither compatible with an idolatrous reign, nor yet with a religious one; and moreover the ſame objection will lie againſt the tranſlator's placing the delivery of this chapter in the religious reign of Jotham: in truth he ſeems to have adverted to this, and endeavours to obviate it, but apparently in a manner as inſufficient as all the reſt of theſe arguments. For he contends in 1ſt ch. where idolatry is not plainly mentioned, "that worſhipping on high places does not neceſſarily imply idolatry;" and where idolatry is expreſsly mentioned in the 2d chapter, he contends again that it was not idolatry, properly ſo called; for the idols were not great ones worſhipped publicly, but little portable

houſehold gods worſhipped privately only *: by ſuch a method of expoſition we may make the text mean any thing, which ſhall be moſt convenient for one's argument. Now, in contradiction to the *firſt* of theſe poſitions, we have not merely ſuppoſition to oppoſe, but the expreſs words of Scripture elſewhere; which clearly teſtify, that however innocent the worſhip in high places and groves might be in *religious* reigns, yet in the reign of Ahaz it *neceſſarily implied groſs idolatry* †. Therefore it can by no means

* "The worſhipping on the high places does not neceſſarily impli idolatry; and from what is ſaid of Uzziah and Jotham, we may preſume, that the public exerciſe of idolatrous worſhip was not permitted in their time. The idols therefore *here* ſpoken of muſt have been ſuch, as were deſigned for a private and ſecret uſe. Such probably were the Teraphim, ſo often mentioned in Scripture, a kind of houſehold gods of human form, as it ſhould ſeem (ſee 1 Sam. xix. 13. and compare Geh. xxxi. 34.) of different magnitude, uſed for idolatrous and ſuperſtitious purpoſes, particularly for divinations and oracles." *ch.* ii. *not.* 8.

† "Ahaz walked in the way of the kings of Iſrael, yea, and made his ſon to paſs through the fire—and he ſacrificed and burnt incenſe in the *high places*, and on the *hills*, and under every *green tree*. 2 K. xvi. 3. He made alſo molten images for Baalim. 2 Chr. xxviii. 2." Now what was the *way of the kings* of Iſrael? "The children of Iſrael did *ſecretly* thoſe things, which were not right, they built them *high places* in all

means be granted, that the cenſure of this practice by Iſaiah in his 1ſt chapter is not ſufficiently characteriſtic of the idolatry practiſed under Ahaz. Neither can another remark, which the tranſlator either paſſes over unnoticed or takes for granted, be allowed as juſt, namely, that Iſaiah does not inveigh againſt idolatry in his 1ſt chapter any where except in the 29th verſe (altho' indeed he does not elſewhere *inſiſt* upon any *particular* ſpecies of idolatry). For what do theſe expreſſions mean, "they have rebelled againſt me." *v.* 2. "They have forſaken the Lord, they have provoked the holy one of Iſrael to anger, they are gone away backward." 4. "Ye will revolt more and more." 5. "Your hands are full of blood." 15. "How is the faithful city become a harlot." 21. Have we any ſufficient reaſon to reſtrain theſe phraſes here merely to tranſgreſſions againſt *morality*; when they are the very phraſes repeatedly employed

all their cities, and ſet them up *graven images and groves* in every *high hill*, and under every *green tree*, and there they burnt incenſe in all the high places as did the *heathen*." 2 K. xvii 9. And what reformation did Hezekiah make? "He removed the *high places*, and brake the *images*, and cut down the *groves*." 2 K. xviii. 4. Manaſſeh again reſtored the ſame. 2 K. xxi. 3. and Joſiah deſtroyed them once more. 2 K. xxiii. 5. and Hoſea. iv. 13.

elſe-

elſewhere to denote *idolatrous* practices? Accordingly they are actually explained here alſo in this ſenſe by Gataker: and for the right ſenſe of this phraſe in particular, "How is the faithful city become a harlot?" The tranſlator himſelf refers us to Lowth, who ſays, "The ſin of idolatry is commonly ſtiled, going a whoring after other gods; ſee biſhop Patrick." I may add alſo, that the very ſpecies of idolatry pointed out by the tranſlator as ſuitable to the reign of Ahaz, viz. his making his ſon paſs through the fire to Moloch, may not improbably be alluded to in thoſe words "your hands are full of blood;" which practice if altogether aboliſhed in the beginning of Hezekiah's reign, yet would at leaſt ſubſiſt ſtill in the memories of Iſaiah's audience at the delivery of this chapter, as having been not long before frequent in Judah, and ſtill more in the kingdom of Iſrael ſo lately deſtroyed. That every reproof on account of *blood* being ſpilt, does not refer merely to private murders, but alludes to the blood at ſacrifices, and perhaps that at human ſacrifices alſo, may be ſhewn from various paſſages *; and it is a ſenſe very pertinent

* "The ſword of the Lord is filled with blood—with the blood of lambs and goats—for the Lord hath a ſacrifice in Boſrah, and a great ſlaughter in the land of Idumea. *Iſaiah* xxxiv. 6. and xxvi. 21.

in

in the preſent caſe, where ſacrifices had been mentioned juſt before. Again, neither is the *ſecond* poſition better founded: for as the invectives againſt idolatry in the 1ſt chapter are not unſuitable to the idolatrous reign of Ahaz; ſo neither are they unſuitable to the ſucceeding religious reign of Hezekiah, both for the reaſon juſt now hinted, that at leaſt a freſh memory of ſuch late and heinous tranſgreſſions would ſtill ſubſiſt, and be an argument for Iſaiah's prediction of judgment from heaven on that account; and alſo becauſe probably even idolatry of the groſſeſt kind in ſome degree ſubſiſted ſtill in private, after Hezekiah had ſuppreſſed it in public. We know ſufficiently, both from theory and experience, that religious opinions once imbibed are not eaſily rooted out; and as Judah had religious and idolatrous princes almoſt alternately, it can never with probability be ſuppoſed, that the people could really and totally be changed as often as the religion in favor at court was reverſed: this preſumption may be confirmed alſo by paſſages in Scripture. Thus the 29th, 30th, and 31ſt chapters of Iſaiah are underſtood by Lowth, the tranſlator, and others, as containing predictions of the deſtruction of Sennacherib's army (whether rightly or not may be doubted),

doubted) they do not indeed clearly determine when theſe prophecies were delivered; it ſhould ſeem, however, that they place the delivery of them in the reign of Hezekiah, ſomewhere during thoſe eight years, which intervened between the capture of Samaria and the invaſion of Sennacherib *: nevertheleſs even here in theſe chapters, and in the midſt of Hezekiah's reign we meet with ſtrong invectives againſt the idolatry of the Jews at that time †. It cannot be wondered then, that we ſhould meet with the ſame in his 1ſt chapter, delivered (as I contend) about the ſame time in the ſame reign. This reaſoning, however, is only concluſive againſt thoſe, who

* For Lowth in his argument to ch. 28, ſays, "that the ten tribes were carried away captive ſome years before ſeveral of the *foregoing* prophecies were delivered;" therefore much more may we conclude, that it was before the *ſubſequent* prophecies in ch. 29, 30, and 31 were delivered againſt Sennacherib, conſequently theſe muſt have been delivered after the 6th of Hezekiah. The tranſlator alſo agrees with Lowth, that the 33d ch. is an *epinikion*, or triumphant ode upon the deſtruction of Sennacherib's army, and delivered under Hezekiah.

† "Ye ſhall defile the covering of thy graven images of ſilver, and the ornament of thy molten images of gold, xxx. 22. In that day every man ſhall caſt away his idols of ſilver and his idols of gold, which your own hands have made unto you for a ſin." xxxi. 7.

place

place the delivery of the 30th and 31ſt chapters ſo early as the reign of Hezekiah; but I find no ſufficient evidence of this, and much againſt it; they ſeem not to have been delivered until the idolatrous reign of Manaſſeh, and the predictions in them againſt Aſſyria have nothing in their contents which can determine, that they referred to Sennacherib's invaſion in particular, but perhaps to that of Eſarhaddon in the reign of Manaſſeh, or poſſibly only in general to the diſtant and future ruin of the Aſſyrian empire. For juſt as the commentators have referred every prediction, wherein Babylon is mentioned, to Nebuchadnezzar's time and that of Cyrus, without examining, whether it had never been ſubject to any *prior* revolutions; ſo every prediction concerning Aſſyria has been referred to Sennacherib, without conſidering whether they do not rather relate to *later* Aſſyrian events. But however this may be, yet the above proofs, that idolatry in ſome degree ſtill ſubſiſted, even in the moſt religious reigns, may be ſupplied by others taken from Zephaniah and Micah. The former is ſaid in the title to have prophecied only in the religious reign of Joſiah, yet in him alſo we find complaints againſt the idolatry of the times, and theſe can refer only to the

idolatry of Judah *. In Micah alſo we find, that idolatry was ſtill ſubſiſting in the religious times of Hezekiah: the 3d chapter is proved by Jeremiah to have been delivered under Hezekiah; yet in the 5th delivered apparently about the ſame time, he ſays, "thy graven images will I cut off and thy ſtanding images out of the midſt of thee, and thou ſhalt no more worſhip the work of thy hands. I will pluck up thy groves alſo." v. 13. And again to the ſame purport in vi. 16. So that no concluſion can be drawn, either from what is or is not ſaid in the 1ſt chapter of Iſaiah concerning idolatry, in proof of its having been delivered in an earlier or later reign †. I have only to

* "I will cut off the remnant of Baal from this place—and them that worſhip the hoſt of heaven." i. 4.

† But I may obſerve here farther concerning Micah, that an additional proof to that of Jeremiah may be drawn from the 5th chapter itſelf, in favor of its not being delivered before the middle of Hezekiah's reign. We read there, "This man ſhall be our peace [viz. Hezekiah] when the Aſſyrian ſhall come into our land, and when he ſhall tread in our palaces, then ſhall we raiſe againſt him ſeven ſhepherds and eight principal men; and they ſhall waſte the land of Aſſyria with the ſword, and the land of Nimrod in the entrances thereof, and thus ſhall he deliver us from the Aſſyrian, when he cometh into our land." v. 5. Mede, Lowth, and all others, ſeem quite

to obſerve farther concerning the date of theſe 5 chapters, that my ſubſequent expoſition

quite at a loſs for the object of this prediction; if they had attended to the chronology of the times, it might not have remained without a very probable explication. For very ſoon after Sennacherib's return from Egypt, namely, in Hezekiah's 17th year at lateſt, the Medes threw off all obedience to or alliance with him, and ſet up Dejoces for king over themſelves; Herodotus informs us, that this defection conſiſted of ſix diſtinct nations included under the common name of Medes. The Babylonians probably aſſiſted and formed the ſeventh: for ſince the acceſſion of Arbaces the Mede to the Aſſyrian kingdom at Nineveh, the Babylonians, though governed by their own kings, had been tributaries to the Aſſyrian king of kings; they had probably under Nabonaſſar and others, ſtruggled for independence, but whether they had ever fully obtained it is doubtful: the embaſſy which Merodach (Mardocempadus) ſent about the time of this defection of the Medes to Hezekiah, might probably have for its object to invite him to join in the confederacy; who therefore made up the eighth ſhepherd mentioned in Micah. The Jews were fond to magnify their own importance; therefore Iſaiah ſays in a like ſtrain of expreſſion. "Iſrael ſhall be a third with Egypt and Aſſyria." *ch.* xix. 24. We find in Tobit, that after Sennacherib's return from Egypt, "his eſtate is ſaid to be troubled, and that peace ſhould rather be in Media;" his conduct is alſo ſhewn there to have been cruel and tyrannical, and the ſtate apparently without police; which agrees to the account in Herodotus, and he was at laſt ſlain by two of his own ſons. This defection of the Medes was not perhaps effected without ſome military efforts on one ſide or other;

poſition of the arrangement adopted by Iſaiah in his prophetic work, does not depend altogether upon the proof of this point, that the delivery of theſe 5 chapters was later than the capture of Samaria; it is ſufficient for my purpoſe in general, if it was but later than the civil wars under Ahaz: ſo that I have contended for the point in queſtion, in part from a perſuaſion of the truth, and in part only as a medium to aſcertain, what the commentators had not ſufficiently proved from the 7th verſe, that the delivery was after Ahaz and not before. However, if the internal evidence, which I have collected, ſhall be thought ſufficient

and this explains very well the words of Micah, as alſo the reaſon of Sennacherib's haſty retreat from Egypt and Paleſtine; to which his intelligence of this ripening confederacy probably contributed more than the ſtory of the mice in Herodotus, or the ſtrength of Jeruſalem. The Medes and Babylonians could not have fixed on a more proper time for their attempt, than during Sennacherib's diſtant expedition: and the connection of theſe few hiſtoric circumſtances, which have ſurvived the general wreck of the hiſtories of thoſe times, while they explain this paſſage in Micah, ſhew to us both that a kind of ballance of power ſeems to have been an object in view then among the Aſiatic nations, and alſo that Hezekiah acted with policy in ſhutting himſelf up in Jeruſalem, rather than, like Joſiah afterwards, in raſhly taking the field. This conduct is often commended in Iſaiah, under the expreſſion of *taking reſt*.

to

to eſtabliſh alſo this farther fact, that the delivery was even later than the capture of Samaria, this will be of ſome uſe toward rendering the arrangement of ſome of the ſubſequent predictions more regular; though it is not of any indiſpenſable neceſſity in that general plan of arrangement, which I have to trace out.

Iſaiah then, we ſee, begins his prophetic and poetic work in the ſpirit of a Roman ſatiriſt, with breaking out into indignation at a view of the prevailing iniquities of the times under Hezekiah, a heterogeneous medley of religious hypocriſy in ſome, groſs idolatry in others, and notorious immorality in all, notwithſtanding the warning ſo lately given them by thoſe judgments of Jehovah for the like vices, which had already overwhelmed the kingdom of Iſrael: on which account he proceeds to denounce againſt Judah, that the ſame fate is impending on themſelves by an invaſion from the ſame enemy, the Aſſyrians, unleſs they repent and amend; in which caſe he holds forth a hope of ſome mercy from heaven, and of better times afterwards; the truth of the former part of this denunciation he confirms by the actual accompliſhment of a former prophecy of Amos and himſelf againſt Iſrael, and the latter part by a pro-

phecy

phecy quoted from Micah. But in order that this predicted deſolation and future reſtoration might both of them make the more impreſſion; he next ſubjoins an epiſodical *narrative* or *recital* of all the prophecies, which he had delivered, previous to this preſent one againſt Judah, down from his very firſt deſignation to the prophetic office in the laſt year of Uzziah, together with an hiſtorical narration of the chief events by which they had been already almoſt all accompliſhed: theſe are contained in a period of about 38 years, from the laſt year of Uzziah to the captivity of Samaria; and he relates his account of theſe predictions in a regular method, both agreeably to the order of their *delivery*, and at the ſame time, in general, agreeably to the order of their *accompliſhment*. So that this epiſode forms the moſt complete ſpecimen to be found in the prophets of the union of thoſe two methods of arrangement; and although it may not indeed be a ſpecimen of a perfect union, yet it is ſufficiently perfect to prove the preference of this above any of the other methods; for this union frees us from almoſt all doubts concerning the events, which were the objects of the predictions, and by which they were accompliſhed: it proves alſo, that there is no

ſuch

ſuch abhorrence, as Huetius and Le Clerc conceived, between the *ſpiritus propheticus* and *chronologicus*; in caſe it be true, that inſpiration extended to this and every other minute part of compoſition, and that the arrangement here is not the natural reſult of the exertion of human intellects merely, which in every age and in every perſon, although in different degrees and manners, urges men to the obſervance of order and propriety, and ſome kind of fitneſs in ſuiting the work to the end in view. This narrative epiſode extends from the beginning of ch. 6, to the end of the 11th ver. of ch. 17; at the following verſe he *recommences* the ſame ſubject concerning the *future* Aſſyrian invaſion of Judah by Sennacherib, with which he *concluded* the 5th chapter, and he *continues* that denunciation of *woes*, which he had alſo *begun* in the 5th; but with this difference, that the woes denounced in the 5th ch. are *againſt Judah*, and to be inflicted by the Aſſyrian invaders; whereas thoſe continued in the *ſequel* at ver. 12 of the 17th ch. are *againſt the Aſſyrian invaders* themſelves, together with other heathen nations around, there particularly ſpecified, ſuch as the Edomites, Egyptians, and others: ſo that if the 12th ver. of ch. 17 were ſubjoined *immediately* to ch. 5th, they would

would form a connected chain of prophecy concerning all ſuch events, as were *future* to the captivity of Samaria, and which are only interrupted by this hiſtorical epiſode he has introduced concerning all ſuch predictions as he had already delivered before theſe 5 firſt chapters, and *prior* to the captivity of Samaria. This prophecy beginning at verſe 12, of ch. 17, although included in the ſame chapter with the foregoing 11 verſes, according to the preſent inaccurate diviſion into chapters; yet has no manner of connexion with the preceding prophecy concerning Damaſcus and Samaria, as moſt of the commentators have acknowledged; therefore Tremellius, and the tranſlator, make it the commencement of a new chapter or prophecy *: the latter indeed expreſſes alſo ſome doubt, whether this prophecy ſtands in its *right place*;

* Etſi *huic capiti* nulla appoſita eſt inſcriptio, tamen non dubitamus quin de Aſſyriis et Æthiopibus ſit accipiendum cum Sennacheribo militantibus. *Tremell. v.* 12.

" Theſe three verſes of ch. 17. ſeem to have no relation to the foregoing prophecy [concerning Damaſcus and Samaria], to which they are joined: it is a beautiful piece, ſtanding ſingly and by itſelf; for neither has it any connection with what follows: whether it ſtands in its right place or not, I cannot ſay. It is a noble deſcription of the formidable invaſion, and of the ſudden overthrow of Sennacherib." *Tranſl. ch.* 17. *not.* 12.

what

what he conceived to be its right place does not appear, unleſs he meant according to the order of its delivery. But in this ſenſe it will be impoſſible to maintain, that the greater part of the predictions in any of the prophets ſtand in their right places; and indeed this has been the general misfortune, that the commentators have approved of no other order of arrangement being a right one, except that in which the prophecies were delivered: this may be a right order in annals, but was not the order antiently adopted in hiſtory, poetry or oratory; why then in prophecy, which partakes of all three. Nay, even if from theory we could rationally determine, that ſuch ought to have been the order in prophecy likewiſe, yet we are not enquiring now concerning what ought to be, but what was: if then we ſhould not be able to diſcover here this favorite expected order, ſhall we in a pet pronounce the prophetic books deſtitute of all order? Or ſhall we not rather preſume that the ſame authors, who adopted metre, poetic expreſſion, and oratorical arguments, in their prophetic compoſitions, might juſt as naturally and as reaſonably adopt likewiſe ſome mode or other of poetic or oratorical arrangement? Now in this view we find,

that this prophecy does ſtand in its right place: for Iſaiah began, like an upright monitor and guardian of the welfare of his country, with inveighing againſt the prevalent vices of the times, eſpecially among his *own people*; the ill conſequences of which he points out in plain and not flattering terms: this leads him to a *retroſpective view* of the ſalutary admonitions, which he had given before concerning Judah, Iſrael and others, together with the ill effects of their not attending to his former prophetic exhortations; which retroſpective view of paſt affairs, if in poetry, we ſhould call an *epiſode*; in oratory would be more properly termed a *recapitulation* of former counſels and events. We have in the celebrated oration of Demoſthenes *de corona*, after a ſhort introduction, a long *recapitulation* of the counſels, hiſtoric events and circumſtances of the preceding times, very ſimilar to this in Iſaiah, and which begins with the ſubjoined preface *. The recapitulation in Iſaiah, in-

* "Mihi neceſſarium eſt, O Athenienſes, nec minus ad rem, in memoriam veſtram *Revocare*, quæ fuerit in iſtis temporibus rerum geſtarum conditio, ut ſingula ſpectetis ſecundum ipſum tempus et ſtatum unius cujusque. Phocenſi conflato bello, non per me (tunc enim temporis nondum ego in Republica verſatus fueram) primum ita vos affecti eſtis, ut Phocenſes

cludes all his prophecies in a regular order againſt both *Jews* and *Heathens*, which were *antecedent* to the capture of Samaria; then ought to follow according to the order of delivery, the 5 firſt chapters delivered *after* the fall of Samaria and concerning events *future* to it, but relative to the *Jews* only*;

cenſes incolumes eſſe velletis, &c." Demoſthenes begins his recapitulation at a period before he was concerned in public affairs; Iſaiah only from his primary deſignation: and the object of both was the ſame, to lay the blame of paſt misfortunes on the real adviſers of the meaſures, and on the people who accepted the advice.

* I am now happy to find, that I am not quite ſingular in fixing the delivery of the five firſt chapters later than the capture of Samaria; for Meyer in his notes on the Jewiſh Chronicle, *Seder Olam*, has quoted a paſſage from *Jarchi* to the ſame purport, "Rabbi Solomo Jarchi ſcripſit, hanc prophetiam dictam eſſe in diebus Hiſkiæ, *poſt* excidium Samariæ, ideo prophetam dixiſſe, cap. 1. 7. 8. *Terra veſtra vaſtitas eſt, et urbes veſtræ concrematæ igne, et relinquitur filia Zijon, &c. Cap.* 20 *p.* 973. The *Seder Olam* proves alſo, if any dependence is to be placed on the authority of that Jewiſh Chronicle, that the Jews had preſerved no tradition, as to which of the two prophets, Iſaiah or Micah, preceded each other. "Initia librorum docent, hoſce prophetas uno tempore fuiſſe vaticinatos; quis autem alterum anteceſſerit, haud facile ſciri poteſt." *Cap.* 20. I have omitted moreover to obſerve in its proper place, that about the 14th of Hezekiah, he is ſaid to have bounded in riches; for "he ſhewed the ambaſſadors of the king of Babylon the houſe of his precious

which chain of prophecy, being interrupted by the above-mentioned recapitulation only, is again reſumed and compleated after the 11th v. of ch. 17, and down to the concluſion of his work: this ſequel contains firſt, his prophecies againſt the *heathen* nations concerned in Sennacherib's invaſion, ſuch as the Aſſyrians themſelves, the Edomites and Egyptians, and is relative to events all *future* likewiſe to the capture of Samaria*. Then follow prophecies relative to *ſtill later* times; namely, concerning the 2d Aſſyrian invaſion by Eſarhaddon under Manaſſeh, and the future fall of the Aſſyrian kingdom, and ſo forward in a regular order down to the appendix at ch. 40, containing a triumphant ode on the return of the Jews from Babylon under Cyrus. Thus then it appears, that theſe prophecies are all diſpoſed in their *right places*, according to poetic or oratorical arrangement; and, if we turn our view from thence to the hiſtoric arrangement in practice among the antients,

things, the ſilver and the gold, &c." *Iſ.* 39. 2. Theſe were probably the produce of his victories over Moab, Edom and Philiſtia in the beginning of his reign, not of the former commerce at Elath. This removes the objection of Le Clerc. See p. 278 in note.

* In ch. 18. and 19.

during

during the moſt early periods of hiſtory, which have come down to our knowledge; we ſhall again find interruptions of the thread of hiſtory by *recapitulations*, to have been deemed as proper in the laſt as in the two former ſpecies of compoſition. For not only digreſſive recapitulations of various occurrences extraneous to the principal ſubject of hiſtory, tho' connected with it, have been admitted by almoſt all hiſtorians, and approved by the critics, either for the ſake of a convenient mode of information or for mere ornament *; but the very eſſence of that hiſtorical arrangement adopted by ſome, and by Herodotus at leaſt, may be properly ſaid to conſiſt in a ſeries of connected recapitulations of the whole hiſtory of different

* Theon Sophiſta has preſerved another ſpecimen of the nature of the digreſſions admitted by Theopompus, into his hiſtory of Philip of Macedon, and has alſo thus defended the uſe of proper digreſſions, "Digreſſiones longiores ne inſerantur narrationibus cavendum; nam univerſe omnem fugere haud oportet (ſicut Philiſtus fecit) requiem enim dant audientium animis; ſed illas ſolummodo prolixas, quæ tam longe animum abducunt auditorum, ut priora revocare in memoriam ſit opus; qualibus in Philippi rebus Theopompus uſus eſt: Reperiuntur enim alicubi duæ, tres et plures *hiſtoriæ totæ* in digreſſionibus ſuis, in quibus non modo Philippi ſed ne cujuſdam quidem Macedonis fit mentio." *Progymnaſm. c.* 4. vid. vol. 2. p. 156.

nations.

nations. A method therefore, which is thus found to obtain in poetry, oratory and hiſtory in the moſt cultivated ages of antiquity, can never with any ſhadow of reaſon be condemned as an inſtance of diſorder in compoſitions of ſuch a mixed nature as the prophetic expoſtulations of the Jewiſh prophets; in which all thoſe other three ſpecies of writing are found blended together; for the literary arts, cultivated in the colleges and ſchools of the prophets in Egypt and Judea during thoſe early times, had not then advanced ſo far toward perfection, as to ſeparate each of thoſe ſpecies into its own diſtinct and proper form: and if they had, yet there muſt be ſomething natural as well as uſeful and ornamental in a practice, which even in more improved ages has ſo pervaded every kind of writing, as to be eſteemed preferable to the real order of ſucceſſion in events; the latter Horace condemns, as being but a dull, vulgar and beaten round of order *; the former he commends as a teſtimony of judgment †. This practice may indeed in the prophets appear to leſs

* Nec circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem. *Ar. Poet.*

† Ordinis hæc virtus eſt---ut jam nunc dicat jam nunc debentia dici. *Ib.*

advantage

advantage, than in the compoſitions of more critical times; becauſe they exhibit ſeveral different ſpecies of writing joined together and in their rough unformed ſtate: but we are not the leſs indebted, nay indeed the more, to the ſacred canon of the Jews, for having thus preſerved ſuch curious and ſingular ſpecimens of the modes of ſpeaking and writing cultivated in the literary academies of the prophets, near 100 years before the age in which Homer probably flouriſhed; whoſe example we thus find to have rather recommended than invented ſuch narrative epiſodes in epic poetry*. In Jeremiah alſo we have ſome ſimilar tho' more brief recapitulations of former prophecies by him-

* I have obſerved in vol. 1. p. 62, that Homer muſt have lived later than Gyges, becauſe he mentions the *Gygæa lacus* in Lydia, (Il. 20. 390.) which, as tradition has ſaid, was ſo named from *Gygæa* daughter of Gyges. I now find, that it is Euſtathius, who has preſerved this tradition; his words concerning the lake are,

Οἱ δὲ σχολιασται φασιν την Γυγαιην θυγατερα Γυγου. p. 277.

Now Gyges died, according to Herodotus, 61 years before Alyattes acceded; therefore in the 63d Chaldæan year, which is the 4th year of 23d Olymp. the 500th year after Troy, and the 40th after the acceſſion of Hezekiah. Homer's mention of *Gygæa lacus*, might then probably be the reaſon why thoſe antient authors, referred to at p. 69 and 70, placed Homer exactly at this very date of the 23d Olymp. the 500th year after Troy.

ſelf

ſelf and others; the neglect ſhewn to which prophecies he urges alſo as a reaſon for the farther and ſeverer predictions, which he is about to announce *.

* "From the 13th year of Joſiah, even unto this day (that is, the three and twentieth year) the word of the Lord hath come unto me, and I have ſpoken unto you, and ye have not hearkened; and the Lord hath ſent unto you all his ſervants the prophets—therefore, thus ſaith the Lord, becauſe ye have not heard my words: Behold, I will ſend and take all the families of the north, and will bring them againſt this land, &c. ch. 25. 3.

It may not be amiſs to add here what *Lewis* has collected concerning the ſchools of the prophets: "About the time of Samuel there were ſchools of the prophets erected, and many think that he was the author of them: they were places of education, where young perſons, the moſt hopeful of the Levites and Nazarites were inſtructed in religion, the better to prepare themſelves to receive the prophetic ſpirit; not but that God ſometimes beſtowed this ſpirit upon perſons not educated in theſe ſchools. Over theſe little univerſities or colleges of ſtudents, there was ſome venerable prophet a preſident; the ſcholars received prophecies from the mouth of their maſter; they were called *ſons of the prophets*, and they publiſhed theſe to the people; their inſtitution in theſe nurſeries tended alſo to improve their natural faculties, leſt they ſhould be of weak and ſhallow intellectuals; while their underſtanding was advanced in theſe ſchools, they uſed the aſſiſtance of inſtrumental muſic, and ſome have had their ſpirit, ſo elated by the force of muſic, that they have compoſed hymns by a divine energy, moving their minds and tranſporting them beyond the ordinary power of imagination, this is called *propheſying*." Antiq. b. 2. c. 15.

Let

Let us then next examine, whether the predictions and events in this *epiſodical recital* of former prophecies do not follow each other in a regular manner, agreeably both to the order of delivery, and at the ſame time, agreeably alſo to the order of hiſtoric accompliſhment. This and many other articles favourable to methodical diſpoſition and to propriety in the contents, would doubtleſs have appeared much more clear, in caſe any prophane hiſtories of thoſe times had been preſerved*: all that can now be expected is, that we ſhould collect ſuch few ſcattered notices of the order of hiſtoric events, as have eſcaped the general wreck; and if theſe ſhall be found to lead as probably to order as to diſorder, ought we not rather to preſume, that the author had digeſted this epiſode in a regular narrative order, in caſe we cannot find grounds enough to prove the contrary? Nevertheleſs ſome commentators are ſo very fond of diſorder, that by their unwarranted conjectures they produce it, even where we have no ſufficient reaſons to conclude, that it ever did exiſt: thus they create difficulties, inſtead of really

* Si horum temporum hiſtoriam haberemus, paulò accuratiorem, multa intelligeremus in Eſaia aliis que prophetis, que nunc nullo ingenii acumine poſſumus dilucidare. *Le Cl. in Eſaiam.* c. 9, 19.

finding them; and they augment them more by the unreaſonable principles and ſuppoſitions they afterwards aſſume, in order to remove theſe very difficulties and this diſorder of their own creation. The firſt date in this *narration* is *in the year that King Uzziah died*, (ch. 6.) On this the tranſlator after Gataker and others, obſerves, "this phraſe *probably* means *after the death of Uzziah*; as the ſame phraſe, (ch. 14. 28.) means *after the death of Ahaz*." Now that Iſaiah, tho' he expreſsly mentions here Uzziah and Ahaz, ſhould yet be ſuppoſed to mean their ſucceſſors, Jotham and Hezekiah, I muſt confeſs I cannot find to be any way probable; for in that caſe, why could he not juſt as well have ſaid, "When Jotham or Hezekiah began to reign?" However it is a matter of no importance to this *narration*, which of theſe ſenſes is received; and I take notice of it chiefly for the ſake of applying, in general, Gataker's own words in his note on this particular verſe, and which ought to be equally kept in mind in many paſſages afterwards, "when the text taken properly, affords a fit ſenſe, nor doth ought appear in the context to croſs it, it is not ſafe running out into metaphorical [forced] ſenſes." Perhaps thoſe, who firſt invented this conſtruction, thought it neceſſary, that

one

one prophecy at leaſt ſhould be delivered under Jotham, correſpondently to the title, and none ſuited their purpoſe ſo well as this: or did they ſuppoſe, that Iſaiah, a prophet, if he delivered this prophecy before Uzziah's death, might not be able to know, that Uzziah would die before the end of the year; conſequently, that this date in its proper ſenſe might carry ſuſpicion with it of not being affixed until a later time than the delivery of the prophecy? If this was their motive, yet this objection is now intirely removed, ſince we find that this is only a *narration* by Iſaiah himſelf, of prophecies delivered long before the year, in which this narration was *compiled*. In regard to Jotham alſo, ſince Iſaiah began to prophecy before his reign, and flouriſhed until a later one, there ſeems to be no impropriety in Jotham's name being enumerated in the title in its right place, although no prophecy ſhould have been actually delivered in his reign; it is ſeldom that a *general* title will ſuit in every minute particular to the ſubſequent contents: beſides, the meaning of the title may poſſibly be, not that Iſaiah *ſaw* a viſion in every one of thoſe reigns, but that he ſaw a viſion which *concerned* Judah in each of thoſe reigns; accordingly the Syrians began to invade Judea before the death of Jotham.

The

The next date (ch. 7.) is ſaid to be *in the days of Ahaz*; at what time, then in the 16 years of Ahaz, was this prophecy delivered? The commentators have determined, that it muſt have been in the *beginning* of his reign; becauſe Pekah, who is mentioned in this chapter as alive, was ſlain by Hoſhea about the 3d or 4th of Ahaz, after a reign of 20 years. Uſher and the tranſlator place therefore the predictions in this chapter, in the very firſt year of Ahaz; others in the 3d or 4th: but in either caſe, does not this date in its moſt obvious ſenſe ſeem to be oppoſed to the preceding one, ſo as to indicate, that he meant the *end* of Uzziah's reign before, becauſe he certainly means now in the *beginning* of Ahaz? The contents of the prophecy delivered at this date, concerning the deſtruction of the kingdoms of Damaſcus and Iſrael, are included in the 7th, 8th, and 9th verſes, and require ſome illuſtration to clear them from the doubts and difficulties with which they have been overloaded: but as this does not materially concern the arrangement of the *narration* now under conſideration, this ſubject muſt be deferred to ſome future opportunity; when we ſhall find Iſaiah here once more referring to the prophetic words of both Hoſea and Amos, yet without naming either of them.

A third

A third prediction commences at ver. 10 of this chapter, informing us, that although Judah ſhould not be deſtroyed by the confederacy between Rezin and Pekah; yet it ſhould afterwards ſuffer another invaſion from the Aſſyrians, whom Judah had called in to their aſſiſtance againſt Rezin and Pekah. That this was alſo delivered about the ſame time as the foregoing prophecy, appears from two more predictions in the ſubſequent ch. 8. for by theſe, it is plain that Pekah was ſtill alive at the delivery of theſe two laſt predictions*; and both he and Rezin are here threatened with an invaſion from Aſſyria likewiſe. The above three propheciés then were delivered before the 4th of Ahaz; accordingly an Aſſyrian invaſion of Samaria took place before Pekah's death in that year, as we have certain information, in 2. K. 15. 29. but as to Damaſcus the commentators have only ſuppoſed this at the *ſame* time on the ſtrength of thoſe words, "Before the child ſhall have knowledge to cry, my father and my mother, the riches of Damaſcus, and the

* "Foraſmuch as this people—rejoice in Rezin and *Remaliah's ſon*,——now, therefore, behold the Lord bringeth upon *them* the King of Aſſyria—and he ſhall paſs through *Judah*, [alſo] the ſtretching out of his wings ſhall fill the breadth of thy land,—Oh, Immanuel. *ver.* 6.

ſpoil

ſpoil of Samaria, ſhall be taken away before the King of Aſſyria. v. 4." Theſe words according to ſome denote 1 year, according to others 3 years; but however this be, that Damaſcus was perhaps nearly *about* this time taken by Tiglah Pilneſer, is proved by 2 Kings 16, 9; and that he approached even to Judah, ſeems alſo to be intimated by theſe words in 2 Chr. 28. 20. "Tiglah *came unto* Ahaz and diſtreſſed him, but ſtrengthened him not." At this invaſion then of Damaſcus, and certainly at leaſt of Samaria by Tiglah, and his ſubſequent *entry* even into Judah, might be accompliſhed thoſe concluding words of the prophecy, "he ſhall paſs through Judah, &c." for why ſhould theſe words be referred to any *later* Aſſyrian invaſion of Judah, rather than to the *firſt* by Tiglah. There is alſo ſufficient intimation, that another Aſſyrian army had come *near* Jeruſalem before Sennacherib; for Shalmanaſſar came againſt Samaria at the acceſſion of Hoſhea. At ver. 9. begins another prophecy againſt Iſrael, predicting, that the late confederacy between Iſrael and Damaſcus ſhould be turned into a civil war in Iſrael itſelf: this alſo muſt therefore have been delivered about the 4th of Ahaz, when Hoſhea defeated

and

and ſlew Pekah *; from which time until the 12th, theſe civil commotions ſeem to have continued there, and then Hoſhea became king over all Iſrael †. At ch. 9, a prophetic contraſt is exhibited between the diſtreſſed ſtate of Iſrael during thoſe civil wars, and the happier proſpect which Judah ſhould then enjoy, after its deliverance from Rezin and Pekah; eſpecially in having ſuch a promiſing heir to the crown as Hezekiah, of the lineage of David, and now thirteen years old; while this royal line was extinct in the kingdom of Iſrael. At ver. 8, begins ſtill another prophecy againſt Iſrael: the 10th verſe clearly alludes to ſome great calamity lately befallen Iſrael; which was probably the defeat and death of Pekah by Hoſhea; becauſe the ſubſequent part of the prophecy goes on, to deſcribe the diſtreſſed ſtate of Iſrael in having foreign foes to contend with ‡, as well as civil war within itſelf ‖: and

* "Hoſhea made conſpiracy againſt Pekah, and ſmote him and ſlew him, and reigned in his ſtead in the 20th year of Jotham." 2 K. xv. 30. Jotham reigned 16 years: the 20th from his acceſſion therefore was the 4th of Ahaz.

† "In the 12th year of Ahaz began Hoſhea to reign over Samaria." 2 K. xvii. 1.

‡ Ch. ix. 11 and 12.

‖ They ſhall eat every man the fleſh of his own arm. Manaſſeh Ephraim; and Ephraim Manaſſeh." ver. 21.

whether in the 11th ver. we read *adverſaries of Rezin*, or as the tranſlator prefers *princes of Rezin*, I think we may not improbably conclude in either caſe, that Rezin would not have been mentioned, if he had not been ſtill living at the delivery of theſe words. Now we are informed in 2 K. as referred to before, that Tiglah ſubdued Rezin ſome time in the reign of Ahaz, and that he was ſlain, and Damaſcus carried into captivity: but that theſe three events happened at the ſame time, does not ſeem certain; the hiſtorian might mention at once theſe ſeveral events, which yet perhaps happened in ſucceſſion at different times and in different invaſions: and as from this prophecy we find reaſon to think, that Rezin was not ſlain at the *beginning* of the civil wars in Iſrael; ſo in the following chapter we ſhall find reaſon to think, that Damaſcus was not yet *carried into captivity*, but only *ſubdued*; and although the preciſe year cannot be aſcertained, yet it was plainly enough before the civil war in Iſrael ended.

Iſaiah having thus related an account of the ſeveral prephecies, which he had formerly delivered againſt Iſrael, Judah and Damaſcus, proceeds now to inform us of thoſe he had formerly delivered againſt Aſ-

ſyria

ſyria and other heathen ſtates. Firſt of all, againſt Aſſyria in the 10th ch. But at what time was this delivered, and againſt what Aſſyrian king was it directed, againſt Tiglah Pilneſer, Shalmanaſſer or his ſucceſſor Sennacherib? The commentators have unanimouſly agreed, it was againſt the *laſt*, and was not delivered until *after* the capture of Samaria by Shalmanaſſer in the 6th of Hezekiah; in this the tranſlator concurs likewiſe *. But there is a great interval between the 4th of Ahaz, about which time the foregoing prophecies were delivered at the lateſt, and the 6th of Hezekiah, amounting to 18 years: this then raiſes ſome preſumption againſt the preſent explication. This preſumption is increaſed, when we find, that in ch. 11. 13. Ephraim is ſpoken of ſeemingly as being ſtill a nation: and much more, when in ch. 14. 28, we meet with a prophecy delivered in *the laſt year* of Ahaz: and ſtill more when in ch. 17. we find another prophecy concerning the deſtruction of Samaria itſelf, if not of Damaſcus alſo. If the commentators then are right, here is a manifeſt inſtance of diſorder in this *narration* with reſpect to the arrangement of theſe prophecies agree-

* Ch. 10. n. 5.

ably to the time of their delivery. This in courſe engages us to conſider upon what evidence they have referred the delivery of this 10th ch. to ſo *late* a date as after the 6th of Hezekiah: and we find it to be from the 8th and following verſes of ch. 10 *; for there Samaria, they ſay, is ſpoken of being *deſtroyed*. But if we examine thoſe verſes, we ſhall find nothing more to be clearly intimated, except that Samaria was then *ſubdued* as well as Damaſcus; there is nothing to prove, that either of them were then *carried into captivity*. Nay, on the contrary, do not the words "are not my princes altogether *kings*?" rather ſeem to imply, that the nations afterwards enumerated were ſtill exiſting as *kingdoms*, tho' in *ſubjection* to the Aſſyrian king? It is no way *neceſſary* then to refer the delivery of theſe words to a time later than the *captivity* of Damaſcus and Samaria, but only to a time later than when Damaſcus and Samaria firſt came under *ſubjection* to the Aſſyrians: now this, as I have ſhewn already, is allowed by the

* "For he ſaith, are not my princes altogether kings? Is not Calno as Carchemiſh? Is not Hamath as Arpad? Is not Samaria as Damaſcus? As my hand hath found the kingdoms of idols, and whoſe graven images did excel them of Jeruſalem and of Samaria: ſhall I not, as I have done unto Samaria and her idols, ſo do to Jeruſalem and her idols?"

commen-

commentators themſelves to have been about the 4th of Ahaz or at leaſt in his reign, when Tiglah came againſt Damaſcus and Samaria, and even paſſed into Judah. If Rezin was then ſlain and Damaſcus carried into captivity (tho' I ſhould rather think theſe events happened much later than its firſt ſubjection) yet it is certain, that Samaria at leaſt was then reduced to ſubjection only. This prophecy therefore might have been delivered at any time in the reign of Ahaz, *after* Tiglah's invaſion of Damaſcus and Samaria, and thus it will follow the preceding prophecies according to the right order of their delivery. Still farther, we read in 2 K. 17. 3, that Shalmanaſſer alſo came againſt and reduced Hoſhea, as ſoon as he aſcended the throne of Iſrael in the 12th of Ahaz; ſo that the Aſſyrian king, againſt whom this prophecy is directed, might be either Tiglah, or at lateſt Shalmanaſſer; both of their invaſions were before the laſt year of Ahaz, in which a prediction is dated in ch. 14. 28: conſequently, there is not the leaſt juſtifiable pretence for introducing diſorder into this *narration* by referring thoſe words to Sennacherib: and to break in upon the order of ſucceſſion in the dates without neceſſity, is to create diſorder, not to find it.

At ver. 24. of the ſame chapter, another prophecy againſt Aſſyria begins; which the commentators and tranſlator again ſuppoſe not to have been delivered until the time of Sennacherib's invaſion of Hezekiah*; but for this they have no other evidence than mere *ſuppoſition*, and that not of the moſt favourable kind either; altho' hereby they break in upon the order of the narration as much as before. As it is related of Tiglah in 2 Chron. "that he came unto Ahaz, and diſtreſſed him", agreeably to Iſaiah's prediction, "that he ſhould paſs through Judah as well as Samaria, when he came againſt the latter, and ſhould ſtretch out his wings over the land of Judea"; theſe expreſſions ſeem to point out, that he did not attempt to beſiege Jeruſalem, but only approached near it to exact tribute, and then retired again: accordingly it is related, that

* "A deſcription of the march of Sennacherib's army approaching Jeruſalem to inveſt it;---the places here mentioned are all in the neighbourhood of Jeruſalem, from Ai northward to Nob weſtward of it, in coming out of Egypt, he might perhaps join the reſt of his army at Aſdod, and from thence march near the coaſt by Lachiſh and Libnah, which lay in his way, from ſouth to north, and both which he inveſted, till he came to the north-weſt of Jeruſalem; croſſing over to the north of it, perhaps by Joppa and Lydda or ſtill more north thro' the plain of Eſdraelon". *Ch* 10. *n.* 28.

Ahaz

Ahaz was forced to give him preſents. Now theſe facts ſuit much better as being the accompliſhment of the prophecy under conſideration, than the circumſtances of Sennacherib's invaſion; for the deſcription here given by Iſaiah of the march of the Aſſyrian army toward Jeruſalem intimates no hoſtilities, but only an approach to it, and juſt *ſhaking the hand* againſt it, by way of threatning in caſe tribute was not paid. Moreover, that Iſaiah is not here prophetically deſcribing Sennacherib's march from Egypt northward on his return home, as the tranſlator ſuppoſes; but rather the march of Tiglah's army from Samaria ſouthward toward Jeruſalem, ſeems to be confirmed by this circumſtance, that all the places enumerated in this march were ſituated, not to the ſouth and ſouth weſt of Jeruſalem; but to the north and north eaſt, as well as north weſt of the city: many of theſe places therefore were out of Sennacherib's courſe homeward; which is deſcribed by Iſaiah in ch. 37, as being by Lachiſh and Libnah near the ſea coaſt. Hence the tranſlator is forced to *ſuppoſe*, that Sennacherib *croſſed over to the north*, in order to make him come into the track of the cities mentioned in this prophecy; which were all between Jeruſalem and Samaria, and far remote from the plain

plain of Eſdraelon, which was on the north of Samaria. Nob alone ſeems to have been to the north weſt, yet at no great diſtance from Jeruſalem. Laiſh was not the ſame as Lachiſh, as all the commentators agree; nor indeed does the tranſlator aſſert the contrary, yet his words may lead ſome readers to ſuppoſe this: ſo that there is not a ſingle city mentioned here in Iſaiah, which lay in Sennacherib's direct courſe from Egypt, unleſs it were Nob*: it ſeems extraordinary then that Iſaiah ſhould omit all the conſpicuous cities near the coaſt, eſpecially Lachiſh and Libnah, yet mention ſo many of theſe obſcure places in the neighbourhood of Jeruſalem, ſome of them to the north eaſt of it, and quite out of Sennacherib's direct road. The caſe therefore ſeems to be, that wherever the firſt commentators found any mention of an Aſſyrian invaſion, through want of attention they attributed it to Sen-

* Jerom ſays, that Nob was near Lydda (Dioſpolis) therefore not far from the coaſt. Lais is by Euſebius, Jerom, and others, antient and modern, ſuppoſed to be the ſame city as that mentioned in Judg. 18. 29: but as this is ſaid to be near the ſprings of Jordan, at a vaſt diſtance from the reſt, Le Clerc and others have more probably ſuppoſed, that Lais here mentioned [Λαισα, Λεις] is the ſame, as Ελεασα, Αλασα mentioned in 1 Macchab. 9. 5, and plainly near Jeruſalem and Berea.

nacherib,

nacherib, without conſidering, whether what is ſaid might not as well or better be aſcribed to Tiglah's or Shalmanaſſer's two invaſions of Iſrael before Sennacherib, or to Eſahaddon's invaſion of Judah afterwards; and in this later annotators have too implicitly followed their example: ſo alſo wherever any mention is made of the fall of Babylon, they have aſcribed all to Cyrus's capture of it, without enquiring whether it had never been ſubject to any calamity before; thus they have often confounded prophecies and events at the diſtance of 150 years from each other, and then pretend, that the prophecies are jumbled together without any kind of order. At the concluſion of this chapter the prophet ſays, "the Lord ſhall lop the bough with terror; and Lebanon ſhall fall by a mighty one." The commentators differ here concerning the people, meant to be humbled. Some ſay Judah, the tranſlator and others think the Aſſyrian army; yet it may be neither; but rather Samaria, whoſe territories were bounded by mount Libanus, or Rezin and the kingdom of Damaſcus, which was ſituated at the foot of mount Libanus: in fact there ſeems to have been an oppoſition intended here between the *mount of Zion*, and *mount Lebanon*; as if he had meant, that the Aſ-

ſyrian

ſyrian ſhould only juſt view, and ſhake his hand againſt *mount Zion*, but ſhould lop the tall cedars in the foreſt of *mount Lebanon*, that is, ſubdue the kingdom of Samaria or Damaſcus, the late enemies of Zion: and this ſenſe ſeems confirmed by what follows, namely, that notwithſtanding this deſolation to the *lofty trees* of Iſrael, yet a rod or ſucker from Jeſſe, the common anceſtor of Iſrael and Judah, ſhould *afterwards* flouriſh in the perſon of Hezekiah K. of Judah; who ſhould revenge this approach of Tiglah to Jeruſalem upon his deſcendant Sennacherib. This connects the words better together, and is juſt as probable a ſenſe as any other: hence alſo we may derive ſome farther doubt, whether the *captivity* of Damaſcus was not future to this prophecy and invaſion, altho' it had been *ſubdued* by Tiglah Pilneſer before: either at Shalmanaſſer's firſt invaſion, or when he returned againſt Hoſhea in his 3d year, on finding a confederacy entered into by him and others with the Egyptians, ſeems to be the time, when Damaſcus was carried into captivity and Reſin ſlain; this however is not material to the order.

The deſolations both by the late civil wars and by the Aſſyrian invaſion of Iſrael and Judah, deſcribed in the foregoing chapter, form

form a natural introduction to the prophecy in the 11th chapter of happier times afterwards both in Judah and Iſrael during the reign of Hezekiah. To the miſeries of thoſe civil wars are oppoſed the bleſſings deſcribed in v. 6, when all civil enmity ſhall ceaſe, "When the wolf ſhall lie down with the lamb; when they ſhall not hurt nor deſtroy in all my holy mountain." That the kingdom of Iſrael was ſtill exiſting at the delivery of this prophecy, may be concluded from v. 13, intimating "that under Hezekiah, the envy of Ephraim ſhall depart, and Judah ſhall not vex Ephraim"; it muſt have been delivered therefore either a little before the death of Ahaz or at the beginning of Hezekiah, more probably however *before* his acceſſion, becauſe there is a date afterwards in the very year of the death of Ahaz. The 10th ver. plainly is a prediction of Sennacherib's future invaſion and overthrow under Hezekiah *: For as I obſerved before, the defence made by Hezekiah, in ſhutting himſelf up in Jeruſalem againſt Sennacherib, is often commended under the idea of his *taking reſt*. The pre-

* "In that day there ſhall be a root of Jeſſe, which ſhall ſtand for an *enſign* to the people, to it ſhall the Gentiles ſeek, and *his reſt* ſhall be glorious." See ch. 5. 26. "He will lift up an *enſign* to the nations from far."

dictions alſo in ver. 14. of Hezekiah's invaſion of the Philiſtines, Edom and Moab confirm, that this chapter was delivered before Hezekiah's acceſſion; for I have proved at p. 121, that theſe were the firſt enterprizes of Hezekiah on his acceſſion. The 15th v. predicts Sennacherib's invaſion of Egypt: the tranſlator obſerves here, "that *tongue* is a very appoſite and deſcriptive expreſſion for a bay, ſuch as that of the Red Sea." I may add, that it is alſo the proper word ſtill in uſe among oriental nations. In Abufeda's deſcription of Arabia, ſubjoined to the Engliſh tranſlation of d'Arvieux's travels, he ſays, "that Mount Sinai by a very high cape jetting out into the Red Sea, divides it into two *arms*", on which the editor obſerves, "in the Arabic it is *into two tongues.*"

Thus have we found no diſorder in that part of this *epiſodical narration*, which contains prophecies againſt Judah and Iſrael from the invaſion of Judah by the Syrians, and the conſequent invitation of the Aſſyrians by Ahaz to aſſiſt him, to the effects of that invitation by their invading Judah alſo, firſt under Tiglah himſelf, and under Shalmanaſſer, and laſtly by Sennacherib.

Iſaiah having thus brought down the *narration* of his former prophecies concerning *the Jews* in a methodical manner (agreeably to the order of their delivery, and at the ſame time agreeably alſo in general to the order of their accompliſhment) as far as to the retaliation, which was to be inflicted on Aſſyria under Sennacherib, for all the calamities brought by his oppreſſive anceſtors on Judah and Iſrael; he next proceeds to *relate* alſo his former predictions of a like retaliation to be inflicted on other *heathen* nations around, which had more or leſs oppreſſed the Jews: this is a very ſufficient mode of connexion and arrangement, without any greater nicety of method; and we have ſeen inſtances of the ſame kind before both in Ezekiel and Jeremiah*, where their predictions againſt the *Jews* are followed by a ſimilar collection of their predictions againſt the neighbouring *Heathen* nations, agreeably to the advice of Jerom; that *ea quæ de unâ re ſunt dicta, non debere oratione dividi*†. The ſecond of theſe *Heathen* kingdoms, which has its impending fate here predicted by Iſaiah, and which juſtly claims the next place after Aſſyria, is the other great Aſiatic kingdom at Baby-

* Chap. 45 and 46, &c.

† See page 150

lon*. The third prediction is againſt the *aggregate* body of Heathen nations in Paleſtine (ch. xiv. 28.); this is expreſſly dated in the *laſt* year of Ahaz, and is it the only date in this portion of the narration: hence we may naturally preſume that the foregoing prophecies were delivered *before* this date, and the ſubſequent ones *after* it, unleſs we can find good proofs to the contrary; but I have ſhewn, that the *preceding* contents afford no ſuch evidence to the contrary, and much in favor of this preſumption, in caſe we do not ſuffer ourſelves to be miſled by the ill-founded conjectures and authority of commentators; and we ſhall alſo find the *ſubſequent* contents equally favorable to this preſumption. For in ch. 15 and 16 Iſaiah proceeds to propheſy againſt Moab *in particular*; and in ch. 17 againſt Damaſcus and Samaria *in particular:* now as theſe three events were accompliſhed *later* than the laſt year of Ahaz, ſo there is no reaſon to think that the prophecies concerning them were delivered *ſooner* than that laſt year of Ahaz. Thus all this concluding portion of Iſaiah's *narration* relative to the *Heathens*, Aſſyria, Babylon, Paleſtine, Moab and Damaſcus, was

* In chap. xiii. and xiv. as far as the end of ver. 27.

both

both delivered later, and alſo accompliſhed later, than thoſe predictions in the *former* portion concerning Iſrael and Judah; to which Heathen kingdoms he ſubjoins the prediction againſt Samaria, as relating to an event ſtill later than the foregoing ones. Iſaiah therefore has done more than Jerom recommended, in claſſing together prophecies *de unâ re*: for he has alſo claſſed thoſe together which happened *circa unum tempus*, by reſerving theſe for his *ſecond* portion, and for the laſt places in it, which were *delivered* as well as *accompliſhed* lateſt. What greater regularity of arrangement can any one require than this? It may, however, be ſtill objected by lovers of order, that here is at leaſt *one* exception to regularity; for at the concluſion of the *firſt* portion Iſaiah has *briefly* announced the future Aſſyrian invaſion of Judah and Egypt by Sennacherib, (ch. 11.) although this did not take place until *after* the fall of Samaria. True, but then it is only *very briefly* intimated, and the more full and explicit annunciation of this event is contained in the 5 firſt chapters and their *ſequel* at ch. 17, all *delivered after* the captivity of Samaria: and even that *brief* prophetic intimation is introduced in a very natural and connected manner; as deſcribing a retaliation to be inflicted

on Aſſyria under Sennacherib in return for the calamities brought by former Aſſyrian Kings, Pul, Tiglah, and Shalmanaſſar upon Iſrael and Judah: it is therefore with propriety placed the *firſt* in order and *before* the retaliation to be inflicted on other Heathen kingdoms leſs powerful in themſelves, or leſs intereſted in the affairs of the Jews, ſuch as Babylon, Paleſtine, Moab, and Damaſcus; for which promiſed important favor to the Jews, after ſo many misfortunes, Iſaiah cloſes that *firſt* portion with a ſacred hymn of thanks in ch. xii. So that at leaſt an *argumentative* order is introduced here, in ſuperſeding the ſtrict hiſtoric and chronologic order. A *ſecond* exception, it may be alſo urged, ſubſiſts in regard to Babylon, and a *third* with reſpect to Damaſcus; for the former event was later than the fall of Samaria, tho' placed before it; and the captivity of Damaſcus is thought to be intimated in 2 Kings as having been effected during the reign of Ahaz, and therefore could not be propheſied of in the *laſt* year of Ahaz: we will examine both theſe caſes for the ſake of illuſtrating the matters of fact; rather than on account of any force in the objections; for, as has been before obſerved, there is already a very ſufficient degree of regularity, by all the Heathen

then kingdoms being here claſſed together in ſucceſſion, whether the events propheſied of are all arranged or not preciſely in that hiſtoric order in which they followed each other. In regard to the propheſy againſt Babylon being placed firſt, though accompliſhed laſt, it has the ſame circumſtance to juſtify it as before in the caſe of Aſſyria; for it was the moſt important kingdom in Aſia after Aſſyria; a kingdom then, which would naturally call next for Iſaiah's attention in his catalogue of the calamities to be inflicted on *Heathen kingdoms*. Moreover the ſtruggles of Babylon to preſerve its independence againſt Aſſyria had either begun under, or at leaſt had been ſtrenuouſly ſupported by Nabonaſſar during the very period contained in this *narration** ; for Nabonaſſar acceded to the kingdom at Babylon about 23 years before Hezekiah, therefore about the time when Iſaiah began to prophecy: the glory which Nabonaſſar had probably acquired by ſuch efforts (for all hiſtories of theſe times have periſhed) would naturally turn Iſaiah's attention firſt of all to this recent ſubject of public admiration; and lead him to point out, that nevertheleſs it would be the fate of Babylon to ſink into ſubjection to Aſſyria at laſt. So that theſe *con-*

* See page 201 in note.

laſt.

teſts at leaſt of Babylon with Aſſyria *preceded* the capture of Samaria, though the *final fate* of Babylon was ſubſequent to it: and the concluſion of this propheſy againſt Babylon expreſſly points out another reaſon alſo, why it was placed here *next after* the prediction againſt Aſſyria, namely, in order to gain credit to the future accompliſhment of the propheſy againſt Aſſyria, by predicting another event equally important and unexpected, which Jehovah *would ſoon* bring about againſt Babylon. "Surely as the Lord hath thought, ſo ſhall it come to paſs; and as I have purpoſed, ſo ſhall it ſtand, that I will break the Aſſyrian in my land *, [in like manner as the kingdom of

* The tranſlator remarks here in his note, "that the Aſſyrians and Babylonians are the ſame people; ſee Herodot. 1. 199, &c." Now that the Aſſyrian kings of Nineveh planted an Aſſyrian colony at Babylon, hiſtory does indeed teſtify; but the country to which the name *Aſſyria* was annexed was adjacent to Nineveh on the north of the Tigris, not to Babylon built on the Euphrates in the plain of Shinar: ſo that the Babylonians can be called Aſſyrians by Herodotus, Strabo, and other prophane authors only becauſe they were deſcended from the inhabitants of Aſſyria. But in the time of Iſaiah, and ever ſince the reign of Arbaces, Aſſyria and Babylon had been diſtinct Kingdoms; the Jews therefore would in courſe have ſome diſtinct names whereby to diſtinguiſh theſe two kingdoms, and nothing could be more obvious than to denominate each of them by the

Babylon] for this is the hand, that is ſtretched out upon *all the* [*Heathen*] *nations*,

the proper names of the reſpective provinces *Aſſyria* and *Babylonia*: accordingly we actually find, that it was by theſe names they diſtinguiſhed the two kingdoms in ſcripture, or by their reſpective adjectives *Aſſyrian* and *Chaldæan*. Before the tranſlator therefore thus aſſerted that theſe names are confounded in ſcripture, and Aſſyrian uſed to denote a king of Babylon, one would have wiſhed that he had produced ſome proof of it from the cotemporary prophets or ſacred writers: it was natural for thoſe writers to uſe theſe proper names with the cuſtomary diſtinction of the age and the country in which they lived; and it is preſumeable they did ſo; but certainly it can be no proof that they did not, becauſe theſe names were confounded by the Greeks, ſuch as Herodotus 300 years afterwards, and Strabo 400 years ſtill later. Inſtead of ſuch ſatisfactory and direct proofs we are only referred to Lowth for the ſame opinion and for his proofs of the fact. Now on turning to Lowth we find, that he has produced two paſſages in ſcripture, where, as he inſinuates, theſe names are not uſed with this diſtinctive propriety; but in truth neither of theſe paſſages amount to the leaſt confirmation of the ſuppoſition, that *Aſſyria* or *Aſſyrian* were ever applied to denote the kingdom of Babylon: for they both relate to the kingdom of Aſſyria at Nineveh, as I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew in its proper place in my *Reſearches*. The only place in ſcripture wherein the title of *Aſſyria* is applied to any other than to the king over Aſſyria at Nineveh in this diſtinctive ſenſe, is in Ezra vi. 22, where it relates to Darius Hyſtaſpis K. of Perſia; but the ſame perſon was alſo in courſe king of Aſſyria likewiſe by the extenſion of the empire; this therefore can form no objection to the uniform propriety of its application by earlier ſacred

the Lord of hoſts hath purpoſed, and who ſhall diſannul it? and his hand is ſtretched out, and who ſhall turn it back? ver. 24." Theſe concluding words appear to come in at the end of this prophecy againſt Babylon, juſt as a burthen to a ſong, or rather as a moral application at the cloſe of a tale *; and they clearly point out to us what the *argumentative* connexion of ideas in the mind of the author was, which induced him to place this prophecy againſt Babylon next after that againſt Aſſyria in the 11th chapter, and thus to break in a

ered authors; for Ezra did not live until near 150 years after Aſſyria and Babylon ceaſed to be ſeparate kingdoms, or the firſt a kingdom at all, and both were involved under ſubjection to the kingdom of Perſia: we muſt then conclude here again, as on many other occaſions, that this aſſertion of Lowth and the tranſlator attributes a confuſion to the ſacred writers, which does not actually ſubſiſt in them. Mr. Gibbon has been miſled into the ſame error, for, ſays he, "Iſaiah announcing the downfall of Babylon and the deliverance of Iſrael, declares from God, with an oath, that he will cruſh the Aſſyrian in my land." *Vindic. of Hiſt. of decline of Rom. Emp.* Vitringa and Kalinſky had fallen into the ſame miſtake before, but as it has been refuted by others, one would have wiſhed not to have found theſe exploded errors revived without any new reaſon alledged for them.

* Similar applications may be found at the concluſion of many poems of the antients, particularly in the Greek Tragedians and the Pſalms; they are ſometimes repeated like the burden of a ſong, as in Pſ. 136.

little

little upon the order of hiſtoric accompliſh-ment for the ſake of the better order of *oratorical argumentation.* After this manner then if commentators would ſeek for the *oratorical and poetic arrangement* in the pro-phets, the connexion of their ideas and arguments, and the chief object in their view, they would find no reaſon to accuſe even thoſe parts as deficient in order of this *argumentative* kind, which may, perhaps, appear deficient in regard to all thoſe other kinds of order before pointed out. The *third* exception will come in courſe to be conſidered a little lower down.

This oratorical argument however, drawn from the fall of Babylon, being only con-tingent and the fact ſtill impending, becauſe future to the cataſtrophe of Aſſyria under Sennacherib, Iſaiah goes on to ſtrengthen it by enumerating other *Heathen* ſtates, the ruin of ſome of which *had already* been ac-tually accompliſhed (when he *related* this epiſode, after the 6th of Hezekiah) agreea-bly to theſe his own more antient prophe-tic viſions concerning them; and the fates of others, tho' ſtill impending, were yet about to be accompliſhed within a *very few* years: ſo that theſe propheſies already accompliſhed would add a ſtill ſtronger con-firmation of veracity to his unaccompliſhed

predictions concerning the fall both of the *Aſſyrian* Sennacherib and of *Babylon*. Such, for inſtance, already *was* the caſe with the *aggregate* body of nations in Paleſtine, and *particularly* in regard to Moab, Damaſcus and Iſrael. The date when the predictions concerning theſe were delivered, is expreſſly annexed; namely, in the year before the acceſſion of Hezekiah (ver. 28.); but whether the calamities here threatened to the whole of Paleſtine were to be inflicted by Hezekiah ſoon after his acceſſion, or by the Aſſyrians under Shalmanaſſar, or by Sennacherib, there is no ſufficient internal evidence to prove. The tranſlator and ſeveral other expoſitors think this to be a propheſy of Hezekiah's exploits againſt the Philiſtines, &c. agreeably to what had been mentioned before in ch. xi. 14. this is indeed the moſt probable account, eſpecially ſince the following prediction againſt Moab appears more certainly to have been accompliſhed by Hezekiah; for the firſt verſe of ch. xvi. and ſeveral others ſeem to point out a plain oppoſition between the ſtate of Moab, as being then ſubject to Judah, and the triumphant ſtate of Zion: neither have we any hiſtoric information tranſmitted to us, that the Moabites

abites were ever invaded by Aſſyria*; ſo that all accuſations concerning diſorder here would be drawn entirely from our ignorance of the hiſtory of the times. The date alſo ſuits with this application of the prediction to Hezekiah: for if the prediction againſt Moab was delivered in the *laſt* year of Ahaz, and if this event was to take place (as mentioned in ch. xvi. 14.) *within three years*, this would be about the very time of Hezekiah's reign, to which, as I have ſhewn, other notices in ſcripture fix the event; namely, between his acceſſion and the capture of Samaria in his 6th year †; the prediction of which laſt calamity therefore is methodically placed the very next after Moab, and thus forms the concluding propheſy of this epiſodical narration, it being alſo in fact the lateſt of theſe events. Whether ſuch another inſtance of deviation as that concerning Babylon, occurs in regard to the propheſy againſt Damaſcus in ch. xvii, and thereby forms a *third* objection as above-mentioned; or whether this be likewiſe arranged agreeably to hiſtoric or-

* Si extaret hiſtoria Moabitidis eorum temporum, poſſemus dicere quo hæc reſpiciant; at cum prorſus nos deficiat, omnia ſint obſcura neceſſe eſt. *Cleric.*

† See p. 121, vol. II.

der, we have not ſufficient hiſtoric evidence to determine any more than concerning Moab. But even in caſe it be thought a deviation from *hiſtoric order*, yet a juſtification may eaſily be diſcovered here alſo, and a reaſon why the fates of Damaſcus and Samaria ſhould be thus cloſely connected together in prediction; if we recollect, that they had been before in a brief manner both indicated together in ch. viii. 4: and moreover that as theſe two ſtates had been alſo leagued together againſt Judah, there is a kind of prophetic juſtice in predicting the ruin of both thoſe ſtates together, which had been ſo cloſely united in the oppreſſion of Judah *; even although it ſhould be true, that the fall of Damaſcus did really *precede* that of Samaria by ſeveral years. But I rather ſuſpect, that the fates of theſe two nations were in fact thus united, and thus both aſſigned to the concluſion of this narration, becauſe this was their right place in *hiſtoric order*; and that the fates of both in reality were the lateſt of all, and happened nearly at the ſame time; namely, when Shalmanaſſar came the ſecond time into Paleſtine, in the 3d of He-

* "As Syria and Damaſcus were confederates againſt Judah, ſo they are threatened with one common deſtruction." *Lowth.*

zekiah to puniſh Hoſhea, king of Iſrael, for having rebelled againſt him, and leagued with *So* king of Egypt; ſome indications of which I have pointed out before*. Damaſcus, indeed, as well as Samaria, had both of them been *ſubjected* before to the Aſſy-

* See p. 316; alſo p. 308; where, as I have ſhewn, there are indications of Rezin's being ſtill alive after the commencement at leaſt of Hoſhea's conſpiracy againſt Pekah. I may add alſo now that when we read in 2 K. xvi. 9, "The king of Aſſyria went up againſt Damaſcus and took it, and carried the people of it captive to Kir, and ſlew Rezin." There is no *neceſſity* to underſtand theſe words to denote that all theſe events happened at the ſame time, or even were effected by the ſame king (Tiglah) and not in ſucceſſion at different times, and by different kings. For we have an inſtance to the contrary in the following paſſage: "Hoſhea made conſpiracy againſt Pekah, and ſmote him and ſlew him, and reigned in his ſtead, in the 4th year of Ahaz." xv. 30. Now the commentators do not underſtand that thoſe four events, the conſpiracy, battle, death of Pekah, and reign of Hoſhea happened all in the very ſame year, the 4th of Ahaz; but only, that the *conſpiracy began* then and was followed afterwards ſucceſſively by the other events; for in ch. xvii. 1. it is expreſsly ſaid, that Hoſhea did not *reign*, at leaſt in *Samaria*, until the 12th of Ahaz." Again it is ſaid, "So was Iſrael carried away out of their own land to Aſſyria: and the king of Aſſyria brought men from Babylon, &c." xvi. 23. Yet it appears afterwards (Ezra iv. 2.) that theſe two events were not effected by the ſame king of Aſſyria, but the former by Shalmanaſſar and the latter by Eſarhaddon.

rians

rians by Tiglah in the reign of Ahaz, but it ſeems to have been agreeable to the prevailing temper and policy of thoſe times, not to exterminate any conquered ſtate by a *captivity*, except after frequent and obſtinate rebellion, as in the caſe of Samaria, and alſo of Judah at laſt: probably therefore Rezin K. of Damaſcus might be involved along with Samaria and Hoſhea in the ſame league with Egypt, as it ſeems to have extended to many ſtates in Paleſtine *; and both he himſelf might have met with his death and his city with captivity about the ſame time with Samaria, when Shalmanaſſar in the third year of Hezekiah came again into Paleſtine to diſſipate this league and puniſh the ſupporters of it. There is at leaſt nothing, as we ſee, contained in 2 K. xvi. 9. which with any certainty contradicts this ſuppoſition: and Jerom expreſsly confirms it; for he ſays, (upon what authority we are ignorant) that the death of Rezin and the captivity of Damaſcus did *not* happen until the reign of Hezekiah; to which opinion other writers alſo have acceded†. So long as we

* See page 121.

† "Rex Aſſyrius Damaſcum tranſtulit in Cyrenem & Razin interfecit, qui erat Rex Damaſci, quæ omnia *Ezekia regnante* perpeſſa eſt." *Hieron. Comment.*

have thus to rely upon ſuppoſitions without any ſufficient hiſtoric knowledge concerning the time and nature of the events in queſtion, it muſt be precarious to aſſert, that there is any deviation here from hiſtoric order: and even if this could be aſſerted, yet I have pointed out traces of a better order; namely, of an oratorical and poetic ſtrain of argumentation, ſufficient to remove the imputation of there being any accidental diſorder here, ariſing from the pretended fact of collection. It were to be wiſhed then, that the tranſlator had not ſupplied ſtrength and authority to that imputation, by ſetting forth as probable with reſpect to the time of delivery, and even as certain in regard to the time of accompliſhment, what ſome of the beſt commentators, we ſee, have conſidered with good reaſon, as being neither probable in the former caſe, nor any way certain in the

ment, c. 17.---Refert hæc Grotius ad Shalmanaſſari tempora, potius ad Sancheribi regnum, aut *ad aliquod aliud*; nimis enim eſt brevis hiſtoria ſacra, quam ut quidquam de ea re hauriri ex ea queat; & orientalium rerum hiſtoriæ profanæ dudum perierunt *Cleric.*— "Capta fuit Damaſcus a Tiglah ante annos aliquot, ſed tum demum diruta eſt per Shalmanaſſarum, & incolæ deportati in Kirum, quum Iſraelis regnum everſum eſt: quod ſexto fermè anno *poſt* hanc prophetiam accidit." *Tremel.*

latter;

latter: for he ſays, "This propheſy was *probably* delivered in the *beginning* of the reign of Ahaz, and *it was fulfilled* by Tiglah's taking Damaſcus and carrying the people captives to Kir." *not.* 1. Now the *only* date in this *ſecond* portion of predictions relative to *Heathen nations* is in the *laſt* year of Ahaz (ch. xiv. 28.); therefore we muſt preſume that the *ſubſequent* propheſies were not delivered *ſooner*, unleſs ſome demonſtrable proof of it ſhould appear: but ſo far is there from being any ſuch clear proof, that Tremellius, we ſee, thought it reaſonable to attribute the *delivery* of this prediction againſt Damaſcus to the *laſt* year of Ahaz, when the two preceding prophecies were delivered; and others mentioned in the note agree with Jerom to its being not *accompliſhed* until under Shalmanaſſar, and even ſo late as the capture of Samaria in the 6th of Hezekiah. Nay, the 4th verſe ſeems to confirm this; for it ſays, "In *that day* the glory of Jacob ſhall be made thin;" which may intimate, that the captivity of Iſrael happened at the *ſame* time as that of Damaſcus, although indeed ſuch a ſenſe is not neceſſarily implied in theſe words.

I may obſerve alſo ſtill further in oppoſition to any imputation of diſorderly arrangement

arrangement here concerning the *captivity* of Damaſcus, that the phraſeology in this paſſage concerning Damaſcus is as ambiguous in determining whether it be a *prophecy* or an *hiſtoric relation*, as the fact itſelf is doubtful, when the city was carried into captivity. For although the title calls it the *burden of Damaſcus*, yet as the learned tranſlator has juſtly obſerved, "it more largely treats of Samaria;" in fact, only the three firſt verſes relate to Damaſcus, and even in theſe the tenſes ſometimes have a paſt ſenſe, and ſometimes a future one; ſo that if the title did not ſtile it the *Burden of Damaſcus*, a cuſtomary title for a prediction of calamity, it might be as well conſidered as a mere hiſtoric relation by Iſaiah of the *paſt* fate of Damaſcus, and of the accompliſhment of what had before been predicted concerning it. It might in that caſe be introduced by him here, merely as a preparatory proof to gain credit to the *future* fall really predicted in this chapter concerning Samaria, of which we have ſeen a ſimilar inſtance in Ezekiel*. Some of the tenſes, indeed, in that part which concerns Damaſcus are in the future, which may be thought inconſiſtent with its being a relation of ſomething

* See P. 176. Vol. 2.

paſt, although in reality they are not. Hence, however, the Septuagint, Jerom, Tremellius, the Vulgate, and Le Clerc take occaſion to make them *all* refer to a *future* event, even thoſe words which really are in a *paſt* tenſe; but the Engliſh verſion and the tranſlator have more accurately varied their tenſes of future and paſt agreeably to the original: not but they alſo underſtand them all nevertheleſs to indicate the capture of Damaſcus as a *future* event. But the very ſame variation, however, of the tenſes will admit alſo of our conſidering them all to refer to the fate of Damaſcus as a *paſt* event, ſince even in the Engliſh verſion and the tranſlator's, the *futures* expreſs nothing more than this: "That Damaſcus *is already* deſtroyed and *ſhall* continue ſo." Therefore the futures are no way inconſiſtent with its being an *hiſtoric relation* of a paſt event, if indeed its captivity was *really* paſt: but ſince this is doubtful, we can come to no determination whether it be a *prophecy* or a *hiſtory*. This, however, may be determined from what has been ſaid; that even although it ſhould be a *prophecy*, yet it does not follow from this, that it muſt have been delivered in the *beginning* of Ahaz, nor yet before his *laſt* year; becauſe it is equally uncertain, whether the captivity

of Damaſcus was effected *ſooner* than the 6th of Hezekiah. So that whether it be a prophecy or hiſtory, yet in neither caſe does the place, which this *burden of Damaſcus* occupies, afford any proof of diſorder, either with reſpect to the date of its *delivery* or of its *accompliſhment*. But it may perhaps be conſidered as affording another inſtance of what the learned author has contended for; namely, that the paſt and future tenſes are not confounded in Hebrew in the groſs manner that commentators have ſuppoſed; but will be found uſed with propriety, if proper attention be given to the time when the prophet is ſuppoſed to deliver the words in queſtion, the event of which he ſpeaks, and his preſent ſituation with reſpect to both*: To an

* Quæ alii ſcriptores quanquam futura, in tempore præſenti imperfecto exponunt, ea Hebræi in præſenti perfecto efferunt. Ex altera autem parte multum ſane ab aliorum ſcriptorum conſuetudine videntur abhorrere; nimirum cum *præterita* in *temporis futuri* forma enunciant; atque ea res magnam habet difficultatem.—Quin hujus modi omnia ſuam vim habeant & proprietatem dubitari omnino nequit; quod ex his multa obſcura jam ſint in tanta linguæ Hebrææ vetuſtate minimè eſt mirandum; quibus tamen ipſis aliqua lux nunnunquam induceretur, ſi diligenter attenderemus, quonam eſſet ſcriptor mentis habitu ſituque, cum ea ederet, quas apud animum ſuum rerum imagines tunc conciperet—aut quæ ſit linguæ natura

example of this which he ſubjoins to the quotation below, may be added another, which I have pointed out at p. 184 in the note, concerning a paſſage in Ezekiel. But however this may be, whether the words be chiefly *narrative* or altogether *prophetic*, the arrangement has in either caſe been proved ſufficiently juſtifiable and regular: for it muſt be always remembered, that we have no buſineſs to prove it to be the moſt regular and excellent arrangement which art can ſuggeſt; but only as regular as is commonly found, or can reaſonably be expected, in the writings of thoſe who are deſtitute of much critical art to chaſtiſe the impetuoſity of their ſtrong and ſublime conceptions; upon the whole, that it contains at leaſt too many traces of connexion, art, and deſign, and too few apparent offences (if indeed any which deſerve to be called offences at all) againſt propriety of arrangement, for it to be adjudged the mere produce of chance in collection.

—exemp. grat. &c. videntur enim Hebræi ſæpenumero ita uſurpare futuri temporis formam, ut non tam *ipſius loquentis* habeat rationem, quam *rei* de qua is proxime loquutus eſt: quæ itaque actio alteri actioni connexa eſt & *conſequens*, vel quæ ſeipſam conſequitur, iterata nimirum aut continuata—id efferunt quaſi *futurum*. *Prælect. Poes. hebr.* 15.

We

We have now gone through the whole of this *epiſodical narration*, ſo far as relates to its *methodical arrangement*: it ſtill remains to make ſome *hiſtoric* remarks concerning the prophecy againſt Babylon, contained in this narration, in order to aſcertain when it was *accompliſhed*: it has already been ſhewn, when it was *delivered*; namely, either in the *laſt* year of Ahaz, or perhaps a little ſooner, and about 45 years before the capture of Babylon by Eſarhaddon. All theſe remarks I have therefore thrown together here at the end. Now the commentators have univerſally ſuppoſed, that this prediction referred to the capture of Babylon by Cyrus king of Media and Perſia, and the conſequent delivery of the Jews from their 70 years of captivity there, about 200 years after its delivery. This opinion is adopted alſo and maintained by the tranſlator in theſe words: "Chapters 13 and 14 foretel the deſtruction of Babylon by the Medes and Perſians; delivered probably in the reign of Ahaz about 200 years before the completion of it. The captivity itſelf of the Jews at Babylon (which the prophet does not expreſſly foretel, but ſuppoſes in the ſpirit of prophecy, as what was actually to be effected) did not fully take place till about 130 years after the

the delivery of this prophecy; and the Medes, who were expreſſly mentioned (ch. xiii. 17.) as the principal agents in the overthrow of the Babylonian monarchy, by which the Jews were releaſed from captivity, were at this time an inconſiderable people, having been in a ſtate of anarchy ever ſince the fall of the great Aſſyrian empire, of which they made a part under Sardanapalus, and did not become a kingdom under Dejoces till about the 17th of Hezekiah."---" Chap. xxi. contains a prediction of the taking of Babylon by the Medes and Perſians,---by Cyrus." Let us then enquire whether this prophecy contains any ſufficient evidence of what is here aſcribed to it, and whether this account of the tranſlator be ſufficiently conſiſtent with prophane hiſtory, to afford any foundation for aſſerting that Iſaiah had the capture of Babylon by Cyrus in his view at 200 years diſtance, and not rather ſome nearer revolution there, if any leſs diſtant one had happened. Now ſuch a one did actually happen under Eſarhaddon within 45 years after the prophecy, namely, in the 16th of Manaſſah; an event alſo, which we ſhall find reaſon to think, that Iſaiah himſelf even lived to ſee *accompliſhed* agreeably to his prediction againſt it, and alſo ſome reaſon to conclude from his

ſubſequent

ſubſequent arrangement, that he had not put a finiſhing hand to the *compilation* of his oracular and oratorical poem of exhortation, until near, if not after this event. Some traditions of the Rabbins ſay, that Iſaiah prophecied ſo late as under Manaſſah, and others, that he was ſlain by Manaſſah*: if theſe traditions then be true, it can no way be improbable, that Iſaiah was alive in Manaſſah's 16th year, ſince he reign'd 55 in all. Again, neither will this appear improbable, if we examine the chronology of Iſaiah's prophecies†: for his firſt was in the *laſt* year of Uzziah; from which unto the 16th of Manaſſah were 77 years.

* See the Biſhop of London's 1ſt note, alſo *Crit. Obſerv.* vol. 2. p. 136. in note.

† The age, to which ſome commentators have extended Iſaiah's life, may indeed be thought improbable, as for inſtance, by Michaelis (*in Diſput. de Iſaia*) to 113; by others to 109; but Calviſius and ſuch as confine his age to 90, and upwards, are not liable to this objection. Theſe latter authors, however, all differ from me in this reſpect, that they place his youth earlier, and conſequently his death earlier; whereas if his youth and firſt prophecy were no earlier than his own earlieſt date in the *laſt year* of Uzziah, he might not exceed 97 at the capture of Babylon by Eſarhaddon, nor even at that king's invaſion of Manaſſeh a few years later: now what proof can we have of the time of his youth and old age ſo ſtrong as his own words?

At

At what age Iſaiah began to prophecy we are ignorant; but as thoſe of his profeſſion were bred to it from their youth in the colleges for that purpoſe, and were then called *ſons of the prophets*; as we know alſo that Samuel was called to the prophetic office, when he was but a child, that he actualy prophecied then, and alſo that all Iſrael acknowledged him while he was ſtill *growing*, to be an eſtabliſhed prophet *, we have no reaſon to ſuppoſe but that Iſaiah might begin at 20 years of age *at lateſt*; in which caſe he would be no more than 97 at the capture of Babylon in the 16 of Manaſſeh. This is no improbable age in itſelf, and leſs ſo if we conſider what accidents do ſometimes ariſe: thus for inſtance in the pariſh, wherein I was born, out of 7 perſons only, who died in 1774, 2 were between 75 and 80 and 3 more between 90 and 97, and are thus entered in the regiſter. If the poet Sophocles lived to 95, why might not the prophet Iſaiah live to 97? and

* "Eli perceived that the Lord had called the child—and the Lord ſaid to Samuel, Behold I will do a thing at which both the ears of every one that heareth it ſhall tingle, &c. and Samuel feared to ſhew Eli the viſion, and Samuel *grew*, and the Lord did let none of his words fall to the ground [unaccompliſhed]—and all Iſrael knew, that Samuel was eſtabliſhed to be a prophet of the Lord." 1 Sam. iii. 8, &c.

the

the rather ſtill, if we add, that he might have iſſued his firſt prophecy before he was 20 years of age; that it was alſo (as I have ſhewn) both a very brief and general one, and in fact contained little more than an application to Judah of what Micah had predicted againſt Iſrael; ſo that it may be rather called a comment by a *Son of a Prophet* on the words of an older prophet, than an original prediction: for it begins with blaming Judah for not *underſtanding* that the words they had *heard* (from Micah) concerned themſelves as well as the Kingdom of Iſrael; it was moreover not followed by any other prediction until the reign of Ahaz 16 years after. Still farther, there ſeems to be evidence alſo in Iſaiah himſelf, that he did actually ſurvive the capture of Babylon, for he ſeems to ſpeak of this event as being *paſt* in ch. 23. 13. The learned tranſlator obſerves there, that "this verſe is extremely obſcure," ſo much indeed may be allowed; nevertheleſs the Septuagint, the Vulgate, Jerom, Tremellius, Le Clerc, Grotius and the Engliſh tranſlators all agree in underſtanding it to mean that ſome great deſtruction had *lately* befallen Babylon through the Aſſyrians*;

* Εαν απελθης εις γην Χαλδαιων, και αυτη ηρημωται απο των Ασσυριων. *Septuag.* Ecce terra Chaldæorum---Aſſur fundavit eam, in captivitatem reduxerunt robuſtos ejus,

and altho' the tranſlator after Perizonius and Vitringa, prefers a different ſenſe, yet he gives no reaſon for this preference, except their authority merely; the ſenſe of thoſe antient tranſlators may be ſhewn alſo to be very pertinent to the reaſoning in the context: if then I am in an error here, it is along with very good and antient company. This ſenſe moreover receives much confirmation from Iſaiah's 20th and 21ſt chapters, as well as from the above antient tranſlators;

ejus, ſuffoderunt domos ejus, poſuerunt eam in ruinam. *Vulg.* Si ieris ad terram Chaldœorum, et ipſa vaſtata eſt ab Aſſyriis. *Hieron.* Now whatever may be the caſe in the Hebrew, yet theſe tranſlations do not ſeem to have been intended to convey the idea of a *future* deſtruction of Babylon, by means of that dextrous prophetic figure of anticipation, as Lowth ſuppoſes here. Jerom at leaſt certainly meant to expreſs a *paſt* deſolation, for he thus explains himſelf in his notes, "Dicitur ad Tyrum, ſi cupiat ire ad Chaldæos, etiam illos inveniat deſolatos,---omnis eorum ædificatio in ruinas concidit," *Comment. c.* 23. Grotius ſays to the ſame purport, "Chaldæa nunc eſt provincia Aſſyriorum." Tremellius in like manner "Confirmat prophetiam adverſus Tyrum exemplo Babylonici regni, quod Sancheribi majore [*Potius* ſucceſſor Eſarchaddon] occupaverant et everterant, ut apparet, 2 R. 17. 24 and 30." Le Clerc accedes to the ſame expoſition: and that paſſage in 2 Kings undoubtedly refers to Eſarhaddon's capture of Babylon. Nevertheleſs a long authoriſed interpretation may be an erroneous one, but we ought to have ſome better ground for a new one than mere opinion.

of

for the 21ſt ch. contains a ſecond prophecy againſt Babylon, and altho' this is indeed delivered, more certainly than the 13th ver. of ch. 23, in a prophetic manner; yet even this alſo has the appearance of containing only another hiſtoric relation of the ſame event; but with this difference, that the event is repreſented here in ch. 21, as if it were then preſent and actually *accompliſhing*, while the prophet was ſpeaking, not as being paſt*: now if this was the real truth, it is no wonder that afterwards in the 23d ch. he ſhould ſpeak of the ſame event as being *compleatly paſt*. Again in ch. 20, he gives us with more certainty an *hiſtoric relation* of another event as *paſt*, which might not improbably be a ſtill *later* event than this capture of Babylon; for he

* The illuſtrious annotator remarks here with great propriety, "that this prophecy is ſingular in its kind for its brevity and force, for the variety and rapidity of the movements---it expreſſes in the ſtrongeſt terms aſtoniſhment and horror on the ſudden ſurpriſe of Babylon." Yet this ſingularity is of ſuch a kind, as excites in readers the idea of an event then preſent and actually *accompliſhing*, rather than of one to be accompliſhed two hundred years afterwards; it is an expreſſive hiſtoric painting rather than a prophetic one; if however it be really true that Iſaiah thus repreſented diſtant future events, we are at a loſs to conceive what more emphatic manner he could adopt, in order to deſcribe preſent ones.

ſays, " In the year that Tartan came unto Aſhdod (when Sargon King of Aſſyria ſent him) and fought againſt Aſhdod and took it; at the ſame time ſpake the Lord by Iſaiah, ſaying, &c." Now when did this event happen? Before the capture of Babylon or after? It might be either, if by Sargon was meant Eſarhaddon, as it ſeems to be. The tranſlator however thinks, " that by Sargon is meant Sennacherib; it might be one of the ſeven names, by which Jerom on this place, ſays, he was called: he is called Sacherdonus and Sacherdan in Tobit. The taking of Azotus muſt have happened before Sennacherib's attempt on Jeruſalem." All hiſtories of theſe tranſactions having periſhed, we have nothing to guide us to the time of this event except the names. As to Tartan this was indeed the name of one of Sennacherib's generals in the 14th of Hezekiah, but the ſame perſon or another of the ſame name might have been alive and ſerved under Eſarhaddon after the 16th of Manaſſeh 31 years afterwards, or at leaſt a few years before this. Sargon is the name of this Aſſyrian king in the Hebrew; and ſo Symmachus, Theodotion, Aquila, the Vulgate and Engliſh have all tranſlated it; the Septuagint however has *Arna* or *Narna*, and Jerom takes notice, that he found the

ſame

ſame word in his copy of the Septuagint. Now we have no teſtimony any where, that Sennacherib was ever ſtiled Sargon; but this name is ſo ſimilar to *Sacherdonos* and *Sacherdan* in Tobit, that they may indeed (as the tranſlator intimates) be not improbably thought to be the ſame: in Tobit, however, this was the name of the ſame king, called elſewhere in ſcripture Eſarchaddon, Aſordon, Aſaraddon, and in the Chaldean æra Aſſaradinos, the ſon and ſucceſſor of Sennacherib, not the name of Sennacherib himſelf. This is plain from Tobit, where Sennacherib is ſtyled *Senacherim*, the ſame as in the Septuagint of Iſaiah, and he is expreſſly diſtinguiſhed in Tobit from Sacherdon; this has never been diſputed by any one, it muſt therefore be a miſtake in the tranſlator to aſſert, that Sennacherib is ſtyled Sacherdonus in Tobit*. If then the king Sargon here was the ſame as Eſarhaddon elſewhere, this event could not have happened until after his acceſſion to the throne of Aſſyria by the murder of Sennacherib, perhaps not till after his conqueſt of Babylon: in what year preciſely the acceſſion of Eſarhaddon was, we are

* Και τινα απεκτενε Σενναχηριμ ὁ Βασιλευς, &c. απεκτειναν αυτον οι δυο υιοι αυτου—και εβασιλευσε Σαχερδονος υιος αυτου αντ' αυτου. *Tobit*, ii. 18 & 21.

ignorant;

ignorant; I have placed it in my table in the ſame year as the defection of the Medes under Dejoces, i. e. in the 17th of Hezekiah, this being a time of turbulence and innovation, ariſing perhaps from the murder of Sennacherib and the flight of his two elder ſons into Armenia: however, his acceſſion might poſſibly have been ſeveral years later; but we are certain that it muſt have been before the 16th of Manaſſah; becauſe Eſarhaddon was then in power enough to make himſelf maſter of Babylon. To this, moreover, it is ſome confirmation, that we have no evidence either from ſcripture or Herodotus, that Sennacherib beſieged Azotus, when he invaded Paleſtine and Egypt; although both Libnah and Lachiſh are expreſsly mentioned as being attacked by him: but it is very poſſible, that Eſarhaddon on his acceſſion might ſend an army into Paleſtine under the ſame general Tartan, as Sennacherib; in order either to revenge his father's haſty flight from it, or by the poſſeſſion of Azotus to ſecure its borders againſt Egypt, *before* he attempted the invaſion of Babylon. This however is only poſſible and not improbable; but we are certain that he invaded Paleſtine at a later period, namely, *after* his capture of Babylon, becauſe at his invaſion of Manaſſah (mentioned

tioned in 2 Chr. xxxiii. 11.) he is ſaid to have carried Manaſſah captive *to Babylon*. The Jewiſh chronicle *Seder Olam* places this captivity in the 22d of Manaſſah, which anſwers very well to the date in the Chaldæan æra of his commencing king of Babylon; yet this invaſion of Paleſtine might nevertheleſs have been ſooner after the 16th of Manaſſah than his 22d year. Hence then, upon the whole, we find, that this hiſtoric paſſage in Iſaiah affords ſome indication, that he was not only alive, but alſo that he even prophecied either not long *before*, or elſe not long *after* the capture of Babylon: for the ſiege of Azotus by Sargon is clearly ſpoken of as a *preſent* event, when Iſaiah uttered the ſubjoined prophecy; which prophecy, if it had really predicted (as the tranſlator aſſerts) "that Azotus ſhould be taken within three years," I might urge this circumſtance as another proof, that the event did not happen at Sennacherib's invaſion; becauſe it does not appear, that his whole expedition took up more than one year. But the truth is, that this prediction about 3 years does not relate to the taking Azotus, but to ſome calamity about to fall on the Egyptians and Ethiopians after that term. We cannot then diſcover any thing in the age of Iſaiah, or in the contents of this

this prophecy, or in the arrangement of the concomitant ones, or in other circumſtances, which gives us any room to deſpair with the tranſlator, "of its being poſſible to clear this hypotheſis from all difficulties;" namely, that Sargon means Eſarhaddon, and that Iſaiah lived to ſee him beſiege Azotus, either before his capture of Babylon or after: on the contrary it is the tranſlator's own account in placing this event *too early*, which is alone found to introduce difficulties and inconſiſtency. But at leaſt we find no difficulty in this hypotheſis ariſing from the age of Iſaiah; for whether the capture of Azotus, if accompliſhed by Eſarhaddon, *preceded* or *followed* the capture of Babylon, yet even in the latter ſuppoſition it does not appear, that Iſaiah muſt have then exceeded 97 years of age.

Theſe conſiderations, then, by removing all difficulty ariſing from the age of Iſaiah, and by giving conſiſtency to all thoſe other paſſages in his prophecies, conſequently add ſtrength to the propoſed explication of his prophecies againſt Babylon in the 13th and 21ſt chapters; which explication tends to ſhew that Iſaiah had in both no other diſaſter to Babylon in his view, than that neareſt one in his own age by its ſubjugation at laſt (after a ſtruggle for independency

pendency of near 200 years) to the Median race of kings over Aſſyria at Nineveh: whereby Babylon ceaſed to be any longer a diſtinct kingdom from the Aſſyrian one; and the Royal Aſſyrian race at Babylon deſcended from Beleſis, the coadjutor to Arbaces, became extinct; or were ejected from the throne either by Eſarhaddon at his capture of it, or by an anarchy and rebellion which had ſubſiſted there for eight years before, as the Chaldæan æra teſtifies. If any one inſtead of *this propoſed explication* prefers the tranſlator's expreſſion, and chooſes to call it this *new hypotheſis*, I have no objection; there being indeed nothing better than mere hypotheſis alſo for the old and common opinion, that Iſaiah meant Cyrus's capture of Babylon; and I only contend, that ſetting hypotheſis againſt hypotheſis, the commentators have no right to lead us by their hypotheſis into the midſt of a wilderneſs, where we can meet with no ſecure foundation, no ſolid principles for reaſoning, but are ſurrounded with eternal confuſion, diſorder, inconſiſtency and improbability: whilſt there is thus another hypotheſis, which is not attended with any of theſe ill conſequences; but has the advantages of order, conſiſtency, propriety, and probability to add to novelty and har-

mony in points of hiſtory and chronology*. This its harmony, then, with hiſtory, will ſtill farther confirm my hypotheſis; if we proceed to ſhew moreover, that the chief hiſtoric notices in the contents of theſe prophecies of Iſaiah, and thoſe very ones which the commentators have inſiſted on as proofs, that Iſaiah meant Cyrus's capture, do in reality juſt as much, nay much more favor my hypotheſis of his having had only Eſarhaddon's ſubjugation of Babylon in his view.

Now theſe hiſtoric notices are *firſt*, Iſaiah's intimation in ch. xiii. that it was the *Medes* who ſhould conquer Babylon; and in ch. xxi. that it ſhould be effected by the *Medes* and *Perſians* in conjunction: hence the commentators conclude, that Iſaiah *muſt* mean the capture under Cyrus, becauſe he was the firſt king of both the Medes and Perſians: the tranſlator alſo has

* Il faut que ceux, qui avancent des conjectures, le faſſent comme conjectures: il n'y a point des anciennes hiſtoires, où l'on ne trouve de ſemblables difficultés, qu'il n'eſt guere poſſible de ſoudre, que par conjectures. Il ſe peut faire, qu'il y en ait diverſes de bien fondées, mais qui, après tout, ne ſont nullement des demonſtrations; ni même des choſes, dont on ſe puiſſe aſſurer, comme des choſes tout-a-fait vraiſemblables. *Le Clerc. Bibl. anc. & modern: tom.* 28 *p.* 116.

thus

thus dreſſed up this argument founded on that circumſtance. "This prophecy, foretelling the deſtruction of Babylon by the Medes and Perſians, was delivered in the reign of Ahaz about 200 years before the completion of it (by Cyrus)---but the Medes, who are expreſſly mentioned in 13. 17. as the principal agents in the overthrow of the Babylonian monarchy, were at this time (viz. when theſe prophecies were delivered) an inconſiderable people, having been in a ſtate of anarchy ever ſince the fall of the great Aſſyrian empire," ch. 13.--- "It contains a prediction of the taking of Babylon by the Medes and Perſians---for ſo far is pretty clear that Darius and Cyrus, the Medes and Perſians are intended here, &c." ch. xxi. 1. and 7. Now this account tho' delivered not as a conjecture, but as a certainty, is ſo far from being conſiſtent with hiſtory, that the concurrent voice of all antient authors, both prophane and chriſtian, repreſent the Medes *at this time*, and ever ſince the fall of the firſt Aſſyrian empire, as being the chief ruling power in Aſia; they being either ſubjects or dependant allies to the 2d race of kings over Aſſyria at Nineveh: but theſe kings were themſelves Medes alſo, being the deſcendants of Arbaces the Mede, who aided by Beleſis of

Babylon, deſtroyed the firſt Aſſyrian empire at Nineveh, and eſtabliſhed there a colony or kingdom of Medes. In proof of this Diodorus relates from Cteſias, that "poſt dejectos imperio Aſſyrios, *Medos Aſiæ prefuiſſe*, ſicut tradit Cteſias, Imperatore Arbace." Agreeably to this all other authors, whoſe accounts have been preſerved, ſpeak of the ſucceſſors of Arbaces at Nineveh, as well as of Arbaces himſelf, as being both Medes themſelves by origin, and as commanding over a kingdom of Medes, as well as over the Aſſyrians at Nineveh; and alſo as being the moſt powerful nation in Aſia, and the chief enemies of the Babylonian kingdom. Thus for inſtance, Juſtin from the great hiſtory by Trogus*. Oroſius alſo from antient hiſtorians now periſhed†: another paſſage alſo in Oroſius is worthy of obſervation, as it expreſſly points out, that it was againſt *the Medes*, that the Babylonians had to maintain their independance‡.

* Arbachus imperium ab Aſſyriis ad Medos tranſfert. *lib.* 1. 3.

† Arbachus *regni nomen* et *ſummam* ad Medos tranſtulit. *lib.* 22. Hence we find, that not only the ſupreme power, but the *name* of the kingdom at Nineveh was alſo changed to that of *Medes*.

‡ Diſcedente Arbacto in Medos, partem regni [Aſſyriorum] penes ſe *retinuere* Chaldæi, qui Babyloniam ſibi *adverſus Medos* vindicaverunt. This paſſage

Paterculus agrees in the ſame account*. Euſebius alſo expreſſly calls Arbaces and all his ſucceſſors *reges Medorum*, and ſays that Arbaces *regnum in Medos tranſtulit*†. Syn-

paſſage proves alſo that the kingdom here attributed to the Medes, muſt be the late kingdom of the Aſſyrians at Nineveh, becauſe it is ſaid, that the Chaldæans *retained* a part *of it* to themſelves, of which part alſo the Medes attempted to deprive them; conſequently they had poſſeſſion of all the reſt, and tranſmitted it down by a ſucceſſion of kings unto Eſarhaddon, who firſt deprived the Babylonians of their ſhare of the late Aſſyrian kingdom.

* Imperium aſiaticum ab Aſſyriis tranſlatum eſt ad Medos---a Pharnace [Arbace] Medo---Aſſyrii *principes* omnium gentium potiti ſunt, deinde Medi, poſtea Perſæ, deinde Macedones. *Paterc.*

† Arbaces Medis præfuit annis 28--Aſſyriorum imperio deſtructo regnum in Medos tranſtulit, et interim *ſine principibus* res agebatur uſque ad Dioclem [Dejocem] regem Medorum. In Medio autem tempore Chaldæi *propè prævalebant*, quorum ſeperatæ quædam ſucceſſiones regum feruntur. Reliquæ quoque gentes propiis regibus utebantur. *Chronic.* What Euſebius meant by *ſine principibus* I ſhall have occaſion to ſhew afterwards, when we come to conſider what Herodotus has ſaid on this ſubject, whom Euſebius has here copied and underſtood his words rightly, which is more than the moderns have done: he could not mean that the Medes were *at this time without kings*, becauſe he goes on to enumerate the kings of the Medes deſcended from Arbaces: neither could he mean that other nations were *without kings*, becauſe he immediately adds, that they were all ruled *propriis regibus*: he could then only mean, that Aſia was at this time *without a king of kings*, who claimed

ſub-

cellus confirms Euſebius in this point, notwithſtanding he was always inclined to be ſevere againſt Euſebius, wherever he could find opportunity*. Agathias from Polyhiſtor, ſays, "that the Medes governed Aſia not leſs than 300 years," he muſt then have reckoned theſe 300 years from Arbaces†. Strabo alſo mentions, that "Sub Arbace ad Medos regnum fuit tranſlatum poſtea," *lib.* 16. Thus we ſee, that all authors, both prophane and chriſtian agree in refuting the aſſertions of the tranſlator, who has indeed advanced here ſeveral ſteps farther into errors ſimilar to what Boſſuet had fallen into long ago‡. Prideaux however finding, that *Tiglah* carried colonies of

ſubjection and tribute from the reſt; as the Aſſyrian kings had done before, and as the Medes under Phraortes and Cyaxares did afterwards. This is alſo the right ſenſe of the words of Herodotus, and not that the Medes were *at this time* either a republic or a democracy, in a ſtate of anarchy or an *inconſiderable* people; and in this ſenſe *principes* is uſed by Paterculus above.

* Μηδων μεν γενοι κατα διαδοχην απο Αρβακου εβασιλευσιν. *Medorum genus per ſucceſſionem ab Arbace regnavit. p.* 205. Ed. Goar.—Μετα Σαρδαναπαλον ποτε μεν Μηδους αρχειν των Ασσυριων, ποτε δε Χαλδαιους. P. 206.

† See my table at p. 216. vol. 2. and p. 343. vol. 1.

‡ Il eſt certain que lorſque Arbace revolta les Medes contre Sardanapale, il ne fit que les affranchir, ſans leur ſoumettre l'empire d'Aſſyrie. *Hiſt. Univ. avant Chr.* 536.

Jews,

Jews into Media, could not help confeſſing, "that this act plainly proves Media to have been then *under* the king of Aſſyria"§. Euſebius intimates moreover, that the ſuperiority of power in Aſia lay between the Babylonians and ſome other nation, (probably the Medes) and that the Babylonians had nearly gain'd the aſcendancy [prope prevalebant] which Syncellus we ſee confirms: this was not improbably under Nabonaſſar, agreeably to the contents of the note at p. 201 of vol. 1; whoſe ſucceſs in this conteſt might give riſe to the celebrated æra computed from his reign, about 100 years after Beleſis, and only 23 years before the acceſſion of Hezekiah. It was nearly about this time, namely before the *laſt* year of Ahaz, that this prophecy againſt Babylon was delivered; *at this time* therefore it was ſo far from being true, that the Medes were in a ſtate of anarchy or an inconſiderable people, that it was a matter of doubt, whether they or the Babylonians were the moſt powerful ſtates in Aſia. But what Euſebius ſeems to leave in ſome doubt, Oroſius, as well as Syncellus, have more plainly aſſerted; namely, that it was the Medes,

§ *Ann.* 739. and the Tranſlator, ſays the ſame at ch. 22. n. 6.

who

who were at that time in conteſt for ſuperiority with the Babylonians: "Chaldei Babyloniam ſibi *adverſus Medos* vindicaverunt: and by his context it clearly appears, that the time he alluded to was during the interval between Arbaces and Dejoces. When therefore we read in Iſaiah, "I will ſtir up the Medes againſt them, i.e. againſt the Babylonians," 13. 17: what are theſe words but a counterpart and confirmation of thoſe in Oroſius? And *Medes* here is only another name for the ſame kingdom of Medes under Eſarhaddon and his predeceſſors at Nineveh, which in other paſſages of ſcripture is ſtiled the kingdom of Aſſur: for all thoſe ſucceſſors of Arbaces the Mede on the throne of Aſſyria were Medes likewiſe, namely thoſe who are known in ſcripture by the names Pul, Tiglah, Shalmanaſſar, Sennacherib and Eſarhaddon; and who are therefore ſometimes denominated from the country of Aſſyria over which they reign'd, and at other times from the race of Medes and the nation, whence they deſcended, and which by means of conqueſt reigned in Aſſyria; juſt as the Tartar princes on the throne of China are ſometimes ſpoken of as being *Tartars*, and at other times as being emperors of China. Moreover, that the very identical king here in queſtion, Eſar-

haddon

haddon; together with his two ſucceſſors Saosduchinus and Chynaladinus, were often ſtiled *Medes*, on account of the race at leaſt from which they ſprung, if not alſo becauſe they were kings over the Medes, either at Nineveh or in Media, we have an additional teſtimony afforded us in the Chaldæan æra, as I have already ſhewn in note to page 272: for before the conqueſt of Babylon by Eſarhaddon the *Aſſyrian* deſcendants of Beleſis reigned there; but between them and the *Perſian* Kings over Babylon the title to the Chaldæan æra inſerts a different race of kings ſtiled *Medes*; now to which of the kings of Babylon, enumerated in the æra, does this name of Medes belong? It could not be to Cyrus and his ſucceſſors, who were indeed kings of Media; for his race is included under the title of *Perſians*. Nabopolaſar again, father of Nebuchadnezzar, did indeed rebel againſt his ſovereign Saracus, king of Chaldea and Nineveh, and ſeated himſelf on the throne, as we are informed by Syncellus; who alone of all authors has quoted and preſerved this important piece of information from Polyhiſtor *: here then a new

* Ως Πολυϊσ῾ωρ Αλεξανδρος---ουλος τραῖηγος υπο Σαρακος του Χαλδαιου βασιλεως ταλεις, κατα του αυτου Σαρακος εις

race of kings began over Babylon; but that Nabopolaſar was of a Median race we have no information; he is only ſtiled *a General of Saracus king of Chaldea:* his ſon Nebuchadnezzar indeed is there related to have married a daughter of Aſtyages, afterwards king of Media; but this could never entitle his ſucceſſors to be called *Medes.* It is then ſtill a queſtion which of the kings of Babylon it was, who were meant by the Medes mentioned in the title? and we can find no other probable anſwer, than that they were Eſarhaddon and his two ſucceſſors; the firſt of whom, being ſon of Sennacherib king of Aſſyria, and his ſucceſſor to the throne of the royal Median race at Nineveh, did, by his conqueſt of Babylon, introduce a race of 3 *Median* kings over Babylon alſo, between the Aſſyrian kings who reigned there before and after them: for this race of Medes was expelled again by the rebellion of Nabopolaſar; and thus Babylon became once more a diſtinct king-

Νινον επιστρατευει---και την αρχην Χαλδαιων και Βαβυλωνος παρελαβεν ὁ αυλος Ναβοπολασαρος. *P.* 210.

Secundum Polyhiſtorem Alexandrum—hic [Nabopolaſar] Dux a Saraco Chaldæo Rege miſſus, in Saracum ipſum adverſus Ninum arma vertit—& imperium Chaldæorum & Babylonis aſſumpſit ipſe Nabopolaſar.

dom

dom governed by an Aſſyrian race. This title to the Chaldæan æra might have been almoſt co-eval with the Median kings in queſtion; but at leaſt we have no reaſon to believe it to have been affixed later than while that æra was in vulgar uſe; or if later, yet at lateſt while all antient hiſtories were ſtill extant; and before thoſe who affixed it were reduced to the poor ſcattered hiſtoric ſcraps, which at preſent we are forced to pick up and be contented with: ſo that this name of Medes in that title may be conſidered to be almoſt of equal authenticity, as if that name had been found in an inſcription upon a medal or a marble at Babylon. This conſiſtant account, however, of the ſtate of theſe antient kingdoms, and of the revolutions there, has been perplexed by ſome modern writers, who have pretended that the antient hiſtorians, quoted above in favor of this account, have all (along with Diodorus) copied too much from the erroneous relations of Cteſias; and that Herodotus, who wrote before Cteſias, has given a different and more accurate account of the ſtate of the Medes after the extinction of the firſt Aſſyrian Empire. It is doubtleſs by theſe writers, that the learned tranſlator has been miſled to the miſrepreſentations in his note concerning the ſtate

of the Medes in the age of Iſaiah: theſe writers have turned the ſcraps of hiſtory concerning the interval in queſtion into a variety of ſhapes, agreeably to their own fancies and conjectures*; but is it reaſonable, that Iſaiah a writer cotemporary with that kingdom of Medes, ſhould be tried and condemned by theſe conjectural ſyſtems of Chronologers 2500 years after his death, though in direct contradiction (as I have ſhewn) to all thoſe antient hiſtorians now extant, who have in their way occaſionally touched upon the ſtate of thoſe times? More eſpecially is this reaſonable, when we add, that the only foundation for any of theſe different conjectural ſyſtems is drawn from a ſingle and brief paſſage in Herodotus, whom they have intangled in the conteſt and attempted to ſet at variance with the other antient hiſtorians; the latter being (they pretend) all corrupted by the fictitious accounts of Cteſias? But although Cteſias was indeed an author not always to be truſted, yet the ſame objection may be made to Herodotus; and moreover there were ſeveral other hiſtorians, who wrote of the affairs of Aſia, beſide Herodotus and Cte-

* Petavius, Uſher, Strauchius, Prideaux, Jackſon, Vitringa, Kalinſky in his *Vaticinia*, 1748.

ſias,

ſias, and ſome of them even before either of theſe two; from the accounts of which other hiſtorians the above-mentioned authors might have copied their extracts, and not ſolely from Cteſias. I purpoſe likewiſe to make ſome remarks on what Herodotus has actually ſaid; for the truth is, that when the words of that hiſtorian are rightly conſidered, we ſhall find nothing in his account of the Medes, which is in reality any way materially *inconſiſtant* with Cteſias and thoſe other antients; but is perhaps rather a confirmation of their relations *: let us, however previouſly apply what has been proved already to the matter under conſideration. *At this time* then, namely, both when Iſaiah *delivered* this propheſy againſt Babylon under Ahaz, and alſo when it was *accompliſhed* by Eſarhaddon 45 years after, we have found that the Medes were not an *inconſiderable people*, but on the contrary were powerful and profeſſed enemies to the independance of Babylon; con-

* This inquiry properly belongs to the ſubject propoſed for our next examination in my *Reaſearches into Chronology*, namely, concerning the Origin of the Kingdom of Medes; but though neceſſity in ſome meaſure introduces it here, yet I ſhall confine myſelf to thoſe points only which moſt immediately relate to the contents of the tranſlator's note.

ſequently,

ſequently, that this name of *Medes* does *juſt as well* ſuit to theſe invaders of Babylon under Eſarhaddon, as to thoſe Medes whom Cyrus led a ſecond time againſt Babylon, 187 years after the delivery of the prophecy. The prediction alſo of that firſt invaſion and calamity to Babylon from the Medes, which many of Iſaiah's audience as well as himſelf might live to ſee accompliſhed, was more likely to prove a perſuaſive argument of the truth of his other predictions againſt Aſſyria, (becauſe it was a fact confirmable by the obſervation of thoſe very perſons who heard it, and *previous* to the final fall of Aſſyria,) than any propheſy could be of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus and the ſame Medes at the diſtance of almoſt two centuries after the prediction; and above fifty years *later* than that very fall of Aſſyria, the prediction of which it is brought to verify. So that *propriety* as well as *hiſtory* gives ſupport to this explication; and it muſt be the effect of a too implicit deference to the ill-founded authority of expoſitors, for any one to draw a proof from the name of the invaders being *Medes*, that Iſaiah had Cyrus's army in his view, rather than that of Eſarhaddon; more eſpecially if we conſider farther, that all the other concomitant events predicted by Iſaiah both before and after

after this in queſtion, were all accompliſhed before his own death, ſo far as we are able to judge; and moreover that he himſelf has actually interwoven brief hiſtoric relations of the accompliſhment of all the reſt, except of that which really predicts the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, in the 40th and following chapters and in them only; which is indeed the place to which methodical diſtribution would naturally aſſign the prediction concerning this the lateſt event of all: nay, Iſaiah has likewiſe, as I have ſhewn, given ſeveral very ſtrong hints, that even the invaſion of Babylon predicted in his 13th and 21ſt chapters was in like manner actually accompliſhed before his own death, as well as the reſt of the con-comitant predictions. So that *analogy* and *arrangement* unite with *propriety*, with *hiſtory* and the acknowledged *ſenſe* of Iſaiah's own words by the moſt antient and many of the beſt modern interpreters, in ſupporting the propoſed explication of theſe two propheſies againſt Babylon.

But altho' there is no reaſon to think that Iſaiah himſelf had Cyrus's *Medes* in his view; yet I do not doubt, but that the Jews after Cyrus, and the firſt Chriſtians likewiſe, explained thoſe two propheſies in this ſenſe, as well as modern commentators ſince:

ſince. For the Jews after their return from captivity at Babylon, were both ignorant and careleſs about former Aſiatic Hiſtory; and being highly intereſted in the invaſion of Babylon by Cyrus, they would naturally apply theſe two firſt propheſies to his actions, as well as thoſe in the laſt 40 chapters; in one of which two firſt propheſies they found it foretold, that the *Medes* ſhould be invader of Babylon, and in the other that it ſhould be the *Medes* and *Perſians* jointly: both of theſe hiſtoric circumſtances, particularly the laſt, ſuited ſo happily to the ſituation of Cyrus, that the Jews could not be ſuppoſed capable of over-looking ſuch a co-incidence; and even if any of them had retained knowledge enough of former hiſtory in Aſia, to ſee that theſe two propheſies had been *already* accompliſhed by Eſarhaddon; yet they would not be the leſs ready to apply them a *ſecond* time to Cyrus, on account of that allegorical and typical method of explaining their ſcriptures, which we have no reaſon to think the product merely of the latter days of Judaiſm. In this the Jews, would have acted no otherwiſe than many of the moſt learned men of Chriſtian times, who all agree, that *different* parts of the ſame propheſy may be even *literally* accompliſhed by different events

events at many hundred years distance from each other; so that what was left unaccomplished at the first event, to which it had any relation, might be fulfilled at a second or third*. It is in this very manner, that the learned translator himself in his note 19, explains the following words of the prophecy in ch. 13. "Babylon shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation," v. 20, namely, that after Cyrus, the king Darius first, then Xerxes, then Seleucus, after this the Parthians should all contribute something to the literal and final accomplishment of those words. In like manner he conceives that the prophecy against Moab in the 24th ch. "may have a view to all of the three great desolations of that country by Shalmanassar, by Nebuchadnezzar, and by the Romans, especially the last, to which some parts of it may seem more *peculiarly applicable*:" and this notwithstanding we have no information preserved, that Shalmanassar or any Asiatic king ever invaded the kingdom of Moab before Nebuchadnessar; but we are informed in

* Sæpenumero habet prophetia, ut plures eventus, natura & tempore disjunctos simul prospiciat, & per diversos veluti gradus ad extremum precipuum que exitum perveniat. *Prælect. Hebr.* 20.

ſcripture that Hezekiah certainly did; why then the latter invaſion ſhould be omitted here, and the former inſerted, can be only aſcribed to that ſame ſpirit of arbitrary applications of prophecy, which influenced the Jews to accommodate a ſecond time the above two predictions concerning the invaſion of Babylon by the Medes and Perſians in ſuch a manner, as moſt intereſted themſelves after their return from captivity there, rather than according to the original idea of Iſaiah: but it is his original idea only, which we ought to be ſtudious to diſcover, not the ſecondary applications of others many hundred years after his death. The Jews then after the captivity might have done the ſame, notwithſtanding they ſhould have been conſcious of theſe two prophecies having been already accompliſhed by Eſarhaddon, *in part* at leaſt, at his prior capture of the ſame city. With reſpect in like manner to thoſe words in the 21ſt ch. "He ſaw a chariot with a couple of horſemen, a chariot of aſſes and a chariot of camels," v. 7. the Jews after Cyrus might have been naturally tempted to ſee as plainly as the learned tranſlator, "that it is pretty clear, that Darius and Cyrus, the Medes and Perſians, were intended to be diſtinguiſhed by the *two* riders,

riders, or the two ſorts of cattle": and this even, altho' they ſhould have been conſcious from hiſtory of its being equally clear, that the chariot with theſe *three* different ſets of cattle might have been already literally accompliſhed at the time of Eſarhaddon's invaſion; who was as much a triple rider, as Cyrus was a double one, the former being then king of the Aſſyrians as well as of the Medes, and (as the tranſlator allows) of the Perſians alſo (ſee his note 22. 6.). But even if the Jews after Cyrus did not thus conceive, that *different portions* of theſe two prophecies might after this manner be *literally* accompliſhed at different times and by different events; yet they might, as I obſerved before, have thought agreeably to their mode of explaining their ſcriptures, that the *whole* of theſe prophecies, altho' *altogether* accompliſhed in a *literal* manner under Eſarhaddon, might nevertheleſs be intended to exhibit by that event only a type, to prefigure in a prophetic way this more intereſting and memorable capture of Babylon by Cyrus; and thus the Jews would at leaſt *figuratively* apply them again a ſecond time to Cyrus. The application then to Cyrus, which the antient Jews and Chriſtians may have made of theſe two propheſies, can afford no evi-

dence, that they were not literally accomplished before, nor that Isaiah himself had any other events in his own view and communicated to him by inspiration, except that first invasion of Babylon by Esarhaddon before the death of the prophet, or very soon after it: neither will this first and literal accomplishment of those prophecies any way prevent, but that they might at the same time be really prophetic likewise, either some part of them literally or the whole typically, of the capture by Cyrus, or even of still later events concerning Babylon.

So far is the single name of *Medes* from proving, that the prophecy in the 13th ch. related to Cyrus, that even the union of the names of *Medes and Persians* in the prophecy in ch. 21, will be found to make no addition to this proof, but rather to prove the contrary, altho' this latter circumstance also is again pressed upon us for this purpose in an argumentative view by the Translator, when he says, "this chapter 21 contains a prediction of the taking of Babylon by the *Medes and Persians*—under Cyrus," *par.* 1. *and n.* 1. For the real names in Isaiah are: *Elam* and *Media**: now Elam, the province of Elymais, bordering on the East side

* "Go up, O Elam: and besiege, O Media." ch. 21.

of

of the Euphrates at its mouth and nearest to the sea and Babylon, is the name generally used in scripture to denote the national power of those provinces on the Eastern side of the Euphrates, whether we now call them Elamites or Persians; and the name of *Persia* (Phars) is not to be found in any scriptural author, who was not in part coeval with Cyrus: It appears first in Daniel, then in Ezechiel, in Ezra, in the last verses of 2 Chron. which are only a duplicate of the first verses of Ezra, in Nehemiah and Esther *. The province of Persia was more inland, mountainous and remote from Babylon than Elymais, and it is distinguished by its antient name of *Parsi* unto this very day: the national power of Elymais was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (assisted probably by Cyaxares) as we learn from Jeremiah (49. 34.). But Cyrus was of the province of Persia, and with him this province first rose into renown

* It may be observed also, that the name *Persians* occurs in Judith; but then we have only the Greek translation of that book and the real name in the original might have been *Elam*: but if it was not and rather *Phars*, this might indeed at first raise some suspicion that this book was not writ, (as there otherwise seems room to think) *during* the captivity at Babylon; yet it would not amount to a sufficient proof, because Cyrus had been king of the Medes and Persians 20 years before his capture of Babylon.

and

and its name alſo firſt became celebrated at the ſame time; his chief victory over Aſtyages, as we learn from Strabo, was at Paſargadæ in the province of Perſia, properly ſo called; and there alſo he built Perſepolis (lib. 15). Hence the critics ſay, that all the ſacred writers before Cyrus are found to ſpeak only of the kingdom of *Elam* or Elymais, and all writers after Cyrus's acceſſion, only of *Perſia* (Phars); the uſe therefore of theſe two names *Elam* and *Phars* is conſidered by them as a mark to aſcertain the age, in which any ſacred writer lived.*

* "Neque Moſes, nec libri regum, nec Eſaias aut Jeremias *Perſarum* meminerunt, neque quiſquam eorum, qui *ante* Cyrum vixerunt: at in Daniele & Ezechiele Cyro *coævis*, & in libris Paralipomenon & Eſdræ & Nehemiæ & Eſther, &c. qui *poſt* Cyrum ſcripti ſunt, *Perſarum* eſt frequens mentio: antea veriſimile eſt Hebræa nomina *Chub* & *Elam* magnam Perſidis partem incluſiſſe. In ea ſententia fuit Joſephus, qui Elymæos fuiſſe dicit Περσων αρχηγετας (*Perſarum generis auctores.*") *Bochart. Phaleg.* 4. c. 10. Hottinger quotes this criticiſm verbatim, and approves it in his *Archæolog. Orient. c.* 4. *de Typograph. Eccleſiaſt. p.* 113. Walton alſo quotes it with approbation, "Occaſionem mutati nominis [viz. ab Elam ad Perſiam] dedit Cyrus, &c. *Proleg. Polygl. Bibl. c.* 16. They all ſuppoſe, that *Phars* is derived from *Pharis*, which in Arabic and Hebrew ſignifies a *horſeman*: now Cyrus, they add, is ſaid by Xenophon in his Romance to have firſt introduced cavalry among the Perſians, and that hence they acquired this new name.

Of

Of this criticiſm then I might have made uſe at p. 210, to prove what is advanced there concerning a prophecy of Ezechiel out of ch. xxxviii. namely, that it could not have been *delivered* until after the acceſſion of Cyrus, becauſe he employs the name *Phars*: But I think it unworthy of a reaſoner, who propoſes to guide us into the ways of truth, to employ proofs, in which he himſelf diſcerns any defect, unleſs when he profeſſes to reaſon upon the principles of others; and this criticiſm I foreſaw to be liable to ſtrong objections. For it may be urged by ſome, that Ezechiel might have employed the name *Phars* prophetically there, juſt as Iſaiah has employed the name Cyrus elſewhere through the ſame ſpirit of prophecy; and thus the one may as well have anticipated the name of the kingdom of Perſia, as the other has certainly anticipated the name of its king 150 years before it was impoſed; it being no novelty in ſcripture for a name to be predicted as well as an event:* whether however this does

* Thus Le Clerc obſerves, "Cum egiſſet Hieronymus ad Gen. xvii. 17. de impoſitione nominis Iſaaci, *Sciendum eſt*, inquit, *quod quatuor in Veteri Teſtamento, abſque ullo velamine, nominibus ſuis antequam naſcerentur vocati ſunt; Iſmael, Iſaac, Solomon & Joſias; lege ſcripturas.* De Salomone nullo ex loco conſtat nomen ei ante natales impoſitum; vide 2 Sam. xii. 24. ubi

not contradict the ſuppoſition of thoſe, who will not extend inſpiration to the words as well as thoughts, I muſt leave to ſuch as are better able to divide the difference between verbal and mental inſpiration. But the ſame reaſoning applies more ſtrongly ſtill to Iſaiah; who if he has in ch. xliv. prophetically anticipated the name of the king Cyrus, might have here in ch. xxi. equally anticipated the name of his kingdom *Pharſ*, in caſe he had really meant that kingdom; which ſince he has not done, this forms a reaſonable preſumption, that he did not mean that later kingdom of Perſia, but the more antient one of Elam, which ſubſiſted in his own age; and that he uſed the name Elam hiſtorically, as being the name of a kingdom juſt as well *known* to his audience as its concomitant Media. As to the manner indeed, in which prophets would or ought to write, this is above our power to determine; all we can attempt to diſcover, is only how they have acted, and to collect their meaning from their words: analogy therefore leads us here to conclude, that Iſaiah meant what he has ſaid, namely, to

ubi primum nomen ejus exſtat. Præterea eſt multo inſignius exemplum hominis, diu ante natales nomine appellati, Cyri nimirum Perſarum regis, Iſaiæ. c. 44. 28. *Cleric. Hieron. Quæſtion.* 13. 12.

pre-

predict an event relative to the kingdom of Elam, which was not deſtroyed until many years afterwards by Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar; and that he did not mean what he has not mentioned, the future kingdom of Perſia. For commentators then to preſume, that Iſaiah here, inſtead of prophetically anticipating the name of *Phars*, has by an oppoſite kind of prophetic figure transferred the name of Elam from its right ſenſe, to denote another neighboring province, which did not riſe up into a kingdom until 50 years after the kingdom of Elam was deſtroyed; in what light can this be conſidered, except as an aſſertion, either that Iſaiah was influenced by the ſpirit of contradiction rather than of prophecy, or that commentators themſelves are able to blow hot and cold with the ſame breath, and at liberty to wreſt the words of a prophet in an arbitrary manner to ſuch ſenſes, as ſhall beſt ſuit with their own arbitrary opinions, however irreconcileable to analogy, and inconſiſtent with their own reaſoning and criticiſms elſewhere? For the above-mentioned critics, we ſee, maintain, that when Daniel and Ezechiel do really uſe the right name *Phars*, it is a proof of their being *coeval* with Cyrus, and that it is uſed by them hiſtorically, not prophetically; but when

Isaiah uses Elam the wrong name for Persia, they contend on the contrary that it is used prophetically or figuratively for Persia, and not historically for that kingdom of Elam, with which Isaiah was *coeval*. This then is one reason, why we ought to conclude, that Isaiah meant the capture of Babylon by Esarhaddon (while he ruled over both the kingdoms of Elam and Media, and while Elam was still subsisting) rather than the distant and later capture by Cyrus, when Elam existed no longer.

But another reason is, because in truth the whole of that criticism of Bochart and others seems to be quite destitute of foundation; this however will not excuse the contradictious reasoning of those, who accede to it as a just criticism, and I know of no commentator who has hitherto objected to it. The insolidity then of that criticism is another reason, why I did not make use of it at p. 210: for it supposes two facts; one of which is undoubtedly not true; and for the other there is no sufficient evidence. There is no sufficient evidence for the supposed fact, that the name *Phars* was first introduced by Cyrus; it might have subsisted long before him as the proper name of the province, called Persia, although it was before him in obscurity; just as its name *Farsi* has

has ſubſiſted ever ſince, and in as much obſcurity now as before Cyrus: but his conqueſts brought the name into celebrity, and this alone may be the reaſon why after his acceſſion the name is found in ſacred writers who were his cotemporaries, and not in more antient ones. But again, that other fact, which thoſe critics have ſuppoſed, is not true, namely, that *Phars* does not occur in any ſacred writer before the acceſſion of Cyrus; for it is found in Ezechiel in his xxviith ch. ver. 10. Now his prediction there againſt Tyre was delivered in the 11th of the captivity of Jehoiakim, or at lateſt before the deſtruction of old Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, therefore 40 or 50 years *before* the acceſſion of Cyrus. What concluſion then are we to draw from this fact? Did Ezechiel employ this name there hiſtorically, and as a name well known and current before the time of Cyrus? Or did he uſe it there through the inſpiration of prophecy as a name, which would become current afterwards? The ſentence itſelf ſeems to afford a very ſufficient proof, that the name is employed as one then currently in uſe; for the ſentence contains no prophecy whatever; but is a bare aſſertion of a paſt or preſent fact concerning Tyre, "that they of *Phars* (Perſia) and of Lud and of

Phut are in thine army:" he ſeems to be ſpeaking of a Perſian band of mercenaries, probably archers, who along with ſome of thoſe other nations ſerved Tyre in defence of the city; and as there is not the leaſt reference either here or any where elſe in that prophecy to Cyrus or the reſtoration of the Jews from captivity at Babylon, there cannot be the leaſt pretence for ſuppoſing, that *Phars* would have been introduced here through the ſuggeſtion of prophecy, nor unleſs it had been as current a name then, as thoſe of the other nations mentioned both before and after it. Here therefore is direct proof from ſcripture againſt the fact ſuppoſed in that criticiſm. Now will any one, rather than give up that ill-founded criticiſm, proceed to a farther ſuppoſition; namely, that Ezekiel, when he put a finiſhing hand to the *compilation* of his prophetic work *after* the acceſſion of Cyrus, might have introduced the word *Phars* there by way of exchange for *Elam*, the former being the more modern name. This would be at beſt to ſupport a weak ſuppoſition by one ſtill weaker, juſt as ſome philoſophers of old ſupported the world by a tortoiſe: but in another view it would tend to a worſe concluſion; for thus a criticiſm, which took its riſe only from a fanciful

ety-

etymology, would end with imputing to Ezekiel anachroniſm and impropriety in his uſe of proper names; if not alſo a ſuſpicion of impoſing on his readers as a prophecy delivered by him 50 years before Cyrus, although according to their criticiſm it would contain a ſuſpicious internal mark of having not been *compoſed* by him until after the acceſſion of Cyrus. Thus indeed it has happened in other caſes likewiſe, that commentators themſelves, by haſtily taking up at firſt with principles and facts not well aſcertained, have in the concluſion inadvertently lent a helping hand to the work of Free-thinkers; whoſe views, like thoſe of the antient Academics, tend to pull down every thing and build up nothing. But in the preſent caſe to what purpoſe is all this? only to defend a mere conjecture, that *Phars* may be derived from *Pharis*; yet Hyde has ſhewn, that it might juſt as well be derived from the Perſian word *Pars*, which, as he ſays, ſignifies a *mongrel wolf* *, or from ſome other unknown root, in caſe it be not a primitive name: nay, Hottinger alſo goes ſo far, as to ſtart a query, why the Perſians ſhould ſend ſo far as to Arabia or Judæa for the name of their

* De Relig. vet. Perſ. c. 35.

own

Phut are in thine army:" he ſeems to be ſpeaking of a Perſian band of mercenaries, probably archers, who along with ſome of thoſe other nations ſerved Tyre in defence of the city; and as there is not the leaſt reference either here or any where elſe in that prophecy to Cyrus or the reſtoration of the Jews from captivity at Babylon, there cannot be the leaſt pretence for ſuppoſing, that *Phars* would have been introduced here through the ſuggeſtion of prophecy, nor unleſs it had been as current a name then, as thoſe of the other nations mentioned both before and after it. Here therefore is direct proof from ſcripture againſt the fact ſuppoſed in that criticiſm. Now will any one, rather than give up that ill-founded criticiſm, proceed to a farther ſuppoſition; namely, that Ezekiel, when he put a finiſhing hand to the *compilation* of his prophetic work *after* the acceſſion of Cyrus, might have introduced the word *Phars* there by way of exchange for *Elam*, the former being the more modern name. This would be at beſt to ſupport a weak ſuppoſition by one ſtill weaker, juſt as ſome philoſophers of old ſupported the world by a tortoiſe: but in another view it would tend to a worſe concluſion; for thus a criticiſm, which took its riſe only from a fanciful

ety-

etymology, would end with imputing to Ezekiel anachroniſm and impropriety in his uſe of proper names; if not alſo a ſuſpicion of impoſing on his readers as a prophecy delivered by him 50 years before Cyrus, although according to their criticiſm it would contain a ſuſpicious internal mark of having not been *compoſed* by him until after the acceſſion of Cyrus. Thus indeed it has happened in other caſes likewiſe, that commentators themſelves, by haſtily taking up at firſt with principles and facts not well aſcertained, have in the concluſion inadvertently lent a helping hand to the work of Free-thinkers; whoſe views, like thoſe of the antient Academics, tend to pull down every thing and build up nothing. But in the preſent caſe to what purpoſe is all this? only to defend a mere conjecture, that *Phars* may be derived from *Pharis*; yet Hyde has ſhewn, that it might juſt as well be derived from the Perſian word *Pars*, which, as he ſays, ſignifies a *mongrel wolf* *, or from ſome other unknown root, in caſe it be not a primitive name: nay, Hottinger alſo goes ſo far, as to ſtart a query, why the Perſians ſhould ſend ſo far as to Arabia or Judæa for the name of their

* De Relig. vet. Perſ. c. 35.

own

own province. But whatever was its origin, this paſſage in the 27th chapter proves the name to have ſubſiſted before Cyrus; and herein Ezekiel is confirmed by Herodotus, who, as we may ſee in a note below, mentions the name *Perſæ* as one among many other equally antient and obſcure names of the neighbouring provinces; the firſt introduction of all which names may juſt as well be attributed to Cyrus, as that of Perſæ. If then Ezekiel uſed *Phars* hiſtorically in his 27th chapter, 50 years *before* Cyrus, he undoubtedly uſed it hiſtorically alſo in his 38th chapter *about* the time of Cyrus: but I would not, at p. 210 bring his uſe there of this name as a proof of that chapter being delivered *after* Cyrus, becauſe it would not prove it; for I was ſenſible of the inſolidity of this criticiſm of Bochart, Walton, and others, concerning the name being firſt introduced by Cyrus, and that the real fact was, he only firſt brought it into notoriety. Since then *Phars* occurs in Ezekiel 50 years before Cyrus, how do we know but that it might have equally ſubſiſted as the name of the ſame obſcure province in the age of Iſaiah, not 150 years before Cyrus? eſpecially if we conſider, that it has ſubſiſted ever ſince Cyrus during 2400 years unto this very day.

day. We muſt therefore in all reaſon conclude hence again, that in caſe Iſaiah had really meant, that the province of *Phars* ſhould be exalted by Cyrus into a great Empire, or had referred to any tranſactions of Cyrus after its exaltation, he would have employed the right and current name *Phars* and not *Elam*, the name of a neighbouring province and kingdom deſtroyed 60 years before Cyrus became conſpicuous; or at leaſt that he would have anticipated *Phars* prophetically as well as *Cyrus*. We cannot indeed pretend to determine from theory how divine inſpiration *ought* or ought not to act; but we have an undoubted right to infer from facts how it *has* acted; and in conſequence to conclude in the preſent caſe, as well as in many others, that inſpiration has not acted unreaſonably and inconſiſtently, in a manner contradictory to analogy and probability, becauſe we have no ſufficient proofs from facts of theſe imputations; and whatever imputations are debaſing in our ideas concerning the conduct of human reaſon, it will be difficult to perſuade men, that the ſame imputations are not equally debaſing in our ideas with reſpect to the conduct of inſpiration: but in what light, except that of a debaſing one, can the common mode of expoſition appear,

which

which tends to affirm, that Iſaiah's prophecies ought to be interpreted, like dreams, by the rule of contraries, and thus that although he has ſaid *Elam*, yet he muſt be underſtood to have meant *Phars?* This alſo, notwithſtanding that in ch. 11. Iſaiah undoubtedly uſes Elam hiſtorically as the name of the kingdom which ſubſiſted in his own days: the ſame again in chap. 22. the former delivered before the 21ſt chapter, and the latter after it *. Can any one then reaſonably ſuppoſe, that in the middle between theſe two paſſages he ſhould employ Elam in a totally different ſenſe; that is, in a kind of metaphorical, figurative and prophetic ſenſe, as denoting a kingdom, which had no exiſtence until 150 years afterwards, when the real kingdom of Elam was extinct?

Laſtly, there is ſtill another reaſon why we may conclude, that Iſaiah did not by Elam mean the kingdom of Perſia under Cyrus; becauſe after the deſtruction of the kingdom of Elam by Cyaxares and Nebuchadnezzar, it ſeems to have remained un-

* "The Lord ſhall ſet his hand again the ſecond time to recover the remnant from Aſſyria, and from Cuſh, and from Elam, &c. *ch.* xi. 11.
"And Elam bare the quiver, &c." *ch.* xxii. 6.

der

der ſuch abſolute ſubjection to one or other of thoſe two crowns *, that it did not ſo much as afford the leaſt aſſiſtance to Cyrus in his enterprize, inſtead of being ſuch a principal in that revolution, as to have ever given its own name to the new kingdom which he raiſed. This fact appears from Herodotus, who has given us a very particular liſt of all the neighbouring provinces, which joined the ſtandard of Cyrus and ſupported him in the revolution; among which the name of *Elymæi* is not found; although many obſcure names are there enumerated, which occur no where elſe; and although *Elymæi* was a name ſo well known, that it continued in ſome celebrity down to chriſtian times†. Jeremiah's information ac-

* "I will ſcatter them toward the four quarters of the heavens, and there ſhall be no nation, whither the outcaſts of Elam ſhall not come; but it ſhall come to paſs in the latter days, that I will bring again the captivity of Elam." *Jerem.* 49. 36. By this it appears, that the nation of Elam was carried into captivity and did not return until after Cyrus: the accompliſhment of this captivity is confirmed by Ezechiel (32. 24.) to have happened long before Cyrus.

† Perſarum complura ſunt genera: eorum *quædam* Cyrus congregavit & a Medis ad deficiendum induxit. Sunt quidem hæc, ex quibus alii omnes dependent, Arteatæ, Perſæ, Paſargadæ, Meraphii, Maſii.—Panthelæi, Deruſiæi, Carmani.—Dai, Mardi, Dropici, Sagartii. *lib.* 1.

counts for this omiſſion; for the principal part of Elam was at that very time in captivity, and probably in Babylon itſelf; ſo that Cyrus could not lead the power of Elam againſt Babylon; but Eſarhaddon might; for Elam was in his time a conſiderable nation, and either ſubjects or auxiliaries to Eſarhaddon and the Aſſyrian kingdom at Nineveh, as the tranſlator himſelf acknowledges*: it is mentioned as a kingdom in the time of Abraham †, but Iſaiah is the next author, in whom any notice of this nation occurs; and when he firſt mentions it, he is ſpeaking of ſome Jews, who were in captivity there during the reign of Ahaz (11. 11.) having been probably ſent there by Pul or Tiglah after their invaſion of Iſrael. At this time therefore Elam was exiſting as a nation; and ſince Iſaiah in chap. 11. ſpeaks of Elam hiſtorically as a nation *then* flouriſhing, and the ſame again in ch. 22. 6; this renders it the more improbable, that in the immediately preceding chapter (the 21ſt) he ſhould mean by that name a quite different kingdom, which did not exiſt until 150 years afterwards, and never was called by the name of Elam, but

* The Medes were ſubject to the Aſſyrians in Hezekiah's time, and ſo perhaps might Elam be, or auxiliaries to them." Ch. 22. *not.* 6.

† Gen. 14. 1.

by

by that of Phars. Upon the whole then the *union* in this prophecy of the names of *Elam* and *Media* tends no more to prove, that Iſaiah had Cyrus's expedition againſt Babylon in his view, than the ſingle name of *Medes* did before.

Now if it ſhould be urged againſt this explication, that no hiſtory has given any relation of ſuch a conqueſt of Babylon, as that attributed here to Eſarhaddon, this is indeed true; but then it is equally true, that no antient hiſtory has been preſerved relative to theſe times: nevertheleſs this important event has fortunately been preſerved from oblivion by other means: that is, by a variety of concurrent circumſtances, which I leave to the diſcuſſion of Uſher, Prideaux, Jackſon, and all other late authors, who have now univerſally and with good reaſon admitted the fact*. I may add moreover,

* Deficiente Babyloniorum ſtirpe regia, poſt octo annorum interregnum, Eſarhaddon rex Aſſyriorum ſub antiquum eos *jugum reduxit*; & occupato Babyloniæ regno per 13 annos illud obtinuit, quemadmodum ex canone regnum Ptolomaico didicimus: illius enim Aſſaradinum noſtrum eſſe Eſarchaddonem, non ipſum nomen modo, ſed etiam ſacræ hiſtoriæ demonſtrat conſenſus, quæ eum ſimul Aſſyriæ & Babyloniæ regem fuiſſe non obſcure indicat; vid. 2 Chron. 33. 11. Eſr. 4. 2. *Uſher, ant. Chr.* 681.

" Eſarhaddon taking advantage of the inter-regnum at Babylon ſeized it, and adding it to his former em-

that we have not even any ſuch ſcrap of an antient author in favor of this fact, as the above quotation preſerved by Syncellus from Polyhiſtor relative to the uſurpation of Nabopolaſar; nevertheleſs the evidence for it, as collected by theſe moderns, ſeems to be full as ſtrong from a combination of concurrent circumſtances, if not more ſo, than if we had found it related at full length in ſuch a ſingle quotation preſerved by an accidental extract. I have then only occaſion to ſubjoin to the proofs of this fact already collected by Uſher and Prideaux, that the above paſſage in Oroſius, *Babylonii ſibi contra Medos vindicaverunt*, by proving frequent wars to have ſubſiſted between the two kingdoms, and frequent attempts by the Medes to deprive the Babylonians of their independance, indicates at the ſame time, that when Babylon was at laſt acquired by Eſarhaddon, it muſt have been in the way of conqueſt rather than by any voluntary and peaceable ſubmiſſion.

pire, thenceforth reigned over both for 13 years." *Prideaux, ann.* 680.

" Eſarhaddon invaded Babylon with a great army in the time of the inter-regnum, and took it, and reduced that kingdom again under the Aſſyrian empire." *Jackſon, v.* 1. *p.* 330. It may be obſerved here, that the Syriac verſion of Tobit has *Sarchedon* inſtead of *Sacherdon*, which approaches ſtill nearer to Sargon.

It

It remains ſtill to examine, whether Herodotus has delivered any different account concerning the ſtate of the Medes in the interval between Arbaces and Dejoces, from that already collected out of Cteſias and other antients; and whether it be ſuch an account as can lay a ſufficient foundation for theſe aſſertions of the tranſlator, in contradiction to thoſe antient hiſtorians, "That the Medes were at this time an inconſiderable people and in a ſtate of anarchy." As this prevalent opinion of ſome modern authors, received from Diodorus, has miſled the commentators to a perverſion of the meaning of Iſaiah's prophecy againſt Babylon: ſo I believe Herodotus has undeſignedly miſled thoſe Chronologers into this opinion, by their not attending to the real meaning of his words; and the tranſlator has too implicitly followed their opinion, although their account of the Medes is in fact as contradictory to the hiſtoric information of Herodotus, as of all other antients. Herodotus having occaſion to begin his brief hiſtory of Media no earlier than with its erection into a ſeparate kingdom under Dejoces, diſtinct from the older kingdom of Medes eſtabliſhed at Nineveh under the deſcendants of Arbaces after the fall of the Aſſyrian empire, he does however preface this

this hiſtory with a ſtill more brief introduction concerning the ſtate of things in Media between the fall of the Aſſyrian empire and Dejoces in the ſubjoined words*. Firſt then it is plain, that Herodotus in this paſſage agrees with Cteſias in regard to the kingdom of Aſſyria being overpowered by the Medes; and that he places alſo an interval between that event and the exaltation of Dejoces to the throne of Media: now what the ſtate of Media was during this interval is the point in queſtion. The other hiſtorians aſſert, that it was a kingdom ſubject to the deſcendants of Arbaces, who were placed on the Aſſyrian throne at Nineveh after his conqueſt of it; but Herodotus does not

* Ασσυριων αρχοντων της ανω Ασιης επ' ετεα εικοσι και πεντακοσια πρωτοι απ' αυτων Μηδοι ηρξαντο απισλασθαι· και κως ητοι, περι της ελευθερης μαχεσαμενοι τοισι Ασσυριοισι, εγενοντο ανδρες αγαθοι και αποσαμενοι την δουλοσυνην ηλευθερωθησαν· μετα δε τουτους και τ' αλλα εθνεα εποιεε τωυτο Μηδοισι. Εοντων δε αυτονομων παντων ανα την ηπειρον, ὡδε αυτις ες τυραννιδα; περιηλθον. *lib.* 1. 95. Quum Aſſyrii annis quingentis viginti ſuperioris Aſiæ dominatum obtinuiſſent, primi Medi ab ipſis deficere cæperunt; & quo modo hi, pro libertate præliati, ſtrenuè ſe geſſerunt excuſſo que ſervitutis jugo in libertatem ſe aſſeruerunt; eodem poſt hos etiam aliæ nationes idem fecerunt quod & Medi. Cæterum quum jam per continentem in univerſum propriis uterentur legibus, hac demum occaſione rurſus potentiæ unius ſummi regis ſuper omnes alias nationes ſubjecti fuerunt [videlicet primum Dejocis regis Mediæ, deinde Perſiæ ſub Cyrum].

ſay

ſay any thing *to the contrary* of this, tho' neither does he, on account of his brevity, *expreſſly* tell us in what ſtate Media continued during that interval, whether it was a kingdom or a republic; he is then only *leſs communicative*, and no way *inconſiſtent* with thoſe other hiſtorians. What information therefore could not be thus derived expreſſly from the words of Herodotus, ſome authors have pretended to collect *indirectly* from ſome particular expreſſions; whereby they have been led to conclude, that at firſt a republic was eſtabliſhed in Media, and afterwards that it was in a ſtate of debility or anarchy: let us examine then whether Herodotus really has any expreſſions, which can authorize ſuch concluſions. Diodorus was the firſt who has fallen into this error *; and although Euſebius has

* Ηροδοτος μεν ουν, κατα Ξερξην γεγενως τοις χρονοις, φησιν, Ασσυριους ετη πεντακοσια προτερον της Ασιας αρξαντας, ὑπο Μηδων καταλυθηναι· επειτα βασιλεα μεν μηδενα γενεσθαι τον αμφισβητησαντα των ὁλων επι πολλας γενεας, τας δε πολεις καθ' εαυτας ταττομενας διοικεισθαι δημοκρατικως· το δε τελευταιον, ὑπο πολλων ετων διελθοντων, αιρεθηναι βασιλεα παρα τοις Μηδοις ανδρα δικαιοσυνη διαφερον, ονομα Κυαξαρην [potius Διοκυην]. *lib.* 2. Herodotus ſane, qui Xerxis tempore floruit, Aſſyrios, quum quingentis annis Aſiæ imperium antea tenuiſſent, a Medis ſubactos eſſe, tradit; hinc per multas ætates nullum fuiſſe regem, qui ſummum imperium ſibi vendicaſſet, civitateſque ſuo quamque loco *populari* ſub adminiſtratione ſe continuiſſe: tandem poſt multorum annorum decurſum Cyaxares (ait) vir juſtitia inſignis, a Medis ad

corrected his misrepresentation of the words of Herodotus, yet many moderns, overlooking this, have too implicitly followed the error of Diodorus*. Now one word, which may be thought to lead to the sense of Diodorus is ελευθερια, when Herodotus says, "That the Medes fought for their liberty;" but then this word includes no idea of their establishing afterwards a republican or democratic liberty among themselves; because it is tied down by the concomitant words to mean only, that the Medes freed themselves from servitude to the foreign dominion of the Assyrians: this then was the only liberty, which they had fought for and acquired, namely, that of one nation being no longer subject to a different nation; but how the nation of Medes, when become thus independant, was governed in itself afterwards, whether by a king, or by a republic, is no way indicated

ad regnum evectus fuit. For the right sense, which Eusebius puts upon the same passage of Herodotus, see p. 355, in note.

* "Herodotus relates, that the Medes lived several years without a king after their revolt." *Jackf.* v. 1. 284.—The Medes first revolted and set up a republican government. *Ibid.* 329. The Medes lived several years in a state of anarchy, as Herodotus tells us, before they chose Dejoces for their king. *Ib.* 283.—The Medes did not become a kingdom under Dejoces till about the 17th of Hezekiah. *Transl.* See before, p. 340.

or

or implied in any part of this ſentence †. The next words, which can be any way conſtrued into an implication of republiciſm are αὐτονομων ὀντων; but neither do theſe indicate, whether a monarchy, republic or democracy was eſtabliſhed either among the Medes, or any where elſe in Aſia: for αὐτονομων again expreſſes nothing more than juſt as before, that *each* Aſiatic ſtate, as well as that of the Medes, was *ſelf-governed* in *later* times, that is, ruled by its own laws and conſtitution, (whatever that conſtitution was) and no longer ſubject to any foreign nation; which like that of the Aſſyrians, ſhould pretend to domineer over the reſt. Euſebius therefore, as we have ſeen, has rendered αὐτονομων ὀντων by *propriis regibus utebantur* inſtead of *propriis legibus*; he having probably had ſufficient information, now periſhed, that the chief part of theſe Aſiatic ſtates at that period were *kingdoms*, not *republics*: and to this we have now found that Herodotus has ſaid nothing in *contradiction*; but only *added*, that Aſia was *at laſt*, as Euſebius

† In like manner Plato ſays, Κυρος ελευθερωσας Περσας, *Cyrus having obtained liberty to the Perſians, &c.* i. e. from foreign ſubjection to the Medes: yet it does not follow hence, that the Perſians eſtabliſhed afterwards a republic among themſelves; on the contrary we know, that they eſtabliſhed a monarchy in the perſon of Cyrus, and this monarchy continued as long as the Perſian power exiſted. *See p.* 295, *in note, vol.* 1.

has well expreſſed his idea, *ſine principibus*, i. e. without there being any nation, either kingdom or republic, which affected ſovereignty over the reſt. Diodorus then, while making collections for his hiſtory, muſt have read this paſſage in Herodotus too haſtily; for as the original paſſage is ſtill preſerved, we have it juſt as much in our power to weigh well the true force of the words, as that hiſtorian; and we can find nothing in them, which any way ſupports his conſtruction of them; in this we are alſo ſtill more confirmed by the right ſenſe, which Euſebius not long after him has extracted from the ſame paſſage. Nevertheleſs many moderns, nay indeed all who have fallen under my obſervation, have overlooked the correction by one antient, as well as the miſtake made by the other. Moreover as Herodotus does not in reality contradict Cteſias in regard to the Medes eſtabliſhing a kingdom and not a republic at Nineveh after their conqueſt of it; ſo neither does he contradict Cteſias in regard to that kingdom of Medes being a powerful and not an inconſiderable people, for he ſays, that μεγα τουτεω και τ'αλλα εθνεα εποιεε τωυτο Μηδοισι*. Now what could Herodotus mean

* Poſt hos etiam aliæ nationes idem fecerunt quod & Medi.

by

by theſe words? He could not mean that other nations in later times, following the example of the Medes, withdrew themſelves from ſubjection *to the Aſſyrians*; for all authors agree, and Diodorus underſtands even Herodotus to ſay, that the Medes abſolutely put an end to the Aſſyrian empire. Thoſe words then muſt mean, that other nations in later times freed themſelves from ſubjection *to the Medes*, juſt as the Medes had before freed themſelves from ſubjection to the Aſſyrians *: but this is in fact the ſame as to aſſert, that the Medes under Arbaces ſucceeded to the univerſal power of the Aſſyrians over Aſia, until by degrees the Babylonians firſt, and then perhaps the Perſians, Armenians and others withdrew themſelves from ſubjection to the Medes; and thus in *later* times all Aſiatic nations became *ſelf-*

* This ſeems to have been the meaning of Herodotus, even although we ſhould tranſlate ἐποίεε τωυτὸ Μηδοισι, as the interpreters do, by *idem fecerunt quod & Medi:* but ſince ποιειν frequently governs a dative of the perſon, *to whom* any thing is done, one ſhould think this phraſe may be here tranſlated *idem fecerunt Medis ipſis*, i. e. other nations did the ſame *to* the Medes, as the Medes had done *to* the Aſſyrians; but of the propriety of this I leave others to judge; for this conſtruction is not neceſſary to make out the ſenſe, which I have attributed to Herodotus, altho' indeed it would render it more explicit and determinate: I only mean to query whether this may not *ſometimes* be found.

governed, αὐτονομων, and nearly upon a par with each other: for thus it appears, that αὐτονομων does not refer to the firſt ſtate of the Aſiatic nations after the fall of the Aſſyrian kingdom; but to their laſt ſtate previous to the exaltation of Dejoces. Even in this laſt ſtate of things therefore the kingdom of Medes at Nineveh and elſewhere were not an inconſiderable people; although indeed they were afterwards reduced ſtill lower by diſunion among themſelves: for thoſe Medes, who after the colony or kingdom eſtabliſhed by ſome of them at Nineveh, ſtill remained in the mother country of Media, growing tired of the cruelty, tyranny, and ill government of Semnacherib their King at Nineveh, they at length followed the example of the other Aſiatic nations; and threw off in like manner all ſubjection to Sennacherib, ſetting up for themſelves in Media a new king Dejoces, and thus forming Media into a kingdom of Medes diſtinct from that other eſtabliſhed before at Nineveh. This ſecond kingdom afterwards conquered the firſt, and re-eſtabliſhed alſo the former ſovereignty of one nation in Aſia over the reſt; firſt, by the empire of the Medes under Cyaxares, and then by that of the Perſians under Cyrus: this is what Herodotus means by his words αὐτις ες τυραννιδας περιηλθον, i. e. the ſtate of Aſia ended juſt

as

as it had begun, not by having ſeveral *co-exiſtent* kingdoms, but ſeveral *ſucceſſive* overgrown kingdoms, which affected a right of ſovereignty over all the reſt, both kingdoms and republics, and thus again were kings of kings in the ſame manner as Aſſyria had been at firſt; it is on account of theſe *ſucceſſive* paramount kingdoms, that he puts τυραννιδας in the plural. It may however perhaps be ſtill urged, that although there are no words in this paſſage, which prove the republiciſm of Media; yet from the ſubſequent account, which Herodotus gives of the ſtate of things in Media previous to the exaltation of Dejoces to the throne, there may be collected ſufficient marks of republiciſm or at leaſt of anarchy to juſtify the tranſlator's note: but neither is even this true; for the many criminal acts which ſubſiſted there, may indeed be proofs of ill government under any conſtitution, but are no more proofs of that government being a republic than a monarchy. It appears indeed from the relation of Herodotus, that the Medes were then oppreſſed by iniquitous civil deciſions in their courts of judicature, and that they found juſtice to be more eaſily obtained by ſubmitting their cauſes to the arbitration of an upright private man, Dejoces: But what is there in this more

than

than all England feels at preſent; yet we are neither in a ſtate of republiciſm nor anarchy? It appears alſo, that in Media, as the juſtice was then little, ſo the crimes were many; there were frauds, thefts, robberies, and perhaps murders enough among them as well as ourſelves: but we neither read of tumults, riots, civil commotions or rebellions: neither is that relaxation of civil diſcipline, which ſubſiſted in Media, attributed to any other time than preciſely during the reign of that identical cruel tyrant at Nineveh Sennacherib. The picture preſented to us in Tobit of the ſtate of things at Nineveh in the ſame arbitrary reign of Sennacherib, agrees with this account of Herodotus concerning Media*; and both of them have more of the features of deſpotiſm and tyranny, than of republiciſm:

* When Sennacherib reigned, his eſtate was troubled, ſo that I could not go into Media—and if the king Sennacherib had ſlain any, when he was come and had fled from Judæa, I buried them privately (for in his wrath he killed many) but the bodies were not found, when they were ſought for of the king. And when one of the Ninevites complained of me to the king, that I buried them and hid myſelf, underſtanding that I was ſought for to be put to death, I withdrew myſelf for fear: then all my goods were forcibly taken away, neither was there any thing left me—and there paſſed not 55 days before two of his ſons killed him. *Tobit* i. 15.

in

in ſhort, they exhibit a true picture of the ſtate of civil government at preſent under the arbitrary government of the Turks, ſuch as on the part of the governed barefaced frauds, robberies, murders, and even civil tumults, yet without the imputation of rebellion; and on the part of the governors extortion, unjuſt connivance, bribery, delays and denials of juſtice; ſo that no reſtitution can be aſked without a preſent, and he only is protected from oppreſſion or adjudged to have innocence on his ſide, who has moſt intereſt or moſt money. Upon the whole then the truth ſeems to be, ſo far as can be collected from theſe accounts of Herodotus, compared with Cteſias and other antients, that after the Medes had freed themſelves from ſubjection to the foreign kingdom of Aſſyria, and advanced kings of their own nation to the throne at Nineveh, they ſoon began to find, that the temper of deſpotiſm is ever the ſame, of whatever race or nation the tyrants are; and that their own kings of the Median race ſoon became as lawleſs oppreſſors as thoſe Aſſyrian ones, whom they had depoſed; ſo that in fact they had only exchanged a foreign ſervitude for a domeſtic one: this therefore induced thoſe Medes, who ſtill continued reſident in Media, and had not followed Arbaces to Nineveh,

Nineveh, to make a ſecond defection from their own country men and Median kings at Nineveh, and to eſtabliſh a ſeparate kingdom in the mother country under Dejoces. Thus then inſtead of finding contradiction between Herodotus and Cteſias in their accounts of this interval between Arbaces and Dejoces, we rather find, that they contribute to ſupply the deficiencies of each other, ariſing from the brevity of both their ſummary relations; for Herodotus dwells moſt upon the ſtate of Media itſelf after Arbaces; whereas Diodorus has quoted from Cteſias only what relates to the ſtate of the Median deſcendants of Arbaces at their kingdom in Aſſyria: and both authors contribute to prove, ſo far as their information goes, that the Medes at this time were neither an inconſiderable people, nor in a ſtate either of republiciſm or anarchy; but that for ſome time they were the chief ruling monarchy in Aſia, and afterwards equal at leaſt to their declared rivals the Babylonians. Herodotus indeed does not ſtop to relate *particular* incidents ſo much as Cteſias; yet his brief account is in one reſpect more explicit than the longer one quoted by Diodorus from Cteſias; becauſe it gives us a *general* ſketch of the balance, revolutions and gradations of power in the ſeveral Aſiatic nations during this

this interval; whereas Cteſias only gives us a liſt of the *particular* kings of the Medes at Nineveh, and ſome of their *particular* actions, without preſenting us with any comparative ſtate of their power with reſpect to other Aſiatic kingdoms. But thus it too often happens, that a ſhort paragraph or two, full of haſty and erroneous aſſertions, as in thoſe by Diodorus, Jackſon and others, when flowing from the pens of writers, whoſe authority is in credit, require many pages of inveſtigation to clear up the whole of the caſe, and to ſhew that miſtake has been inadvertently piled upon miſtake; ſo much more eaſy is it to patch up a ſpecious incoherent building in literature, founded on errors, than when once eſtabliſhed, to take it to pieces again, and erect a more conſiſtent ſtructure upon the ground-work of hiſtoric truth. But, as Tertulian ſays, "Veritati nemo preſcribere poteſt, non ſpatium temporum, non patrocinia perſonarum, non privilegium regionum." Nevertheleſs I do not pretend, that the account, which I have thus collected concerning the ſtate of the Medes *at that time* is accompanied with the utmoſt hiſtoric certainty; the following certainty only is that to which I lay claim, namely, that the hiſtoric ſcraps tranſmitted to us by various antient au-

thors, are too harmonious to be overpowered by a ſingle brief paſſage in Herodotus; which may perhaps ſeem ambiguous to ſome, but to me appears to be not irreconciliable with thoſe other accounts *in any thing*, and to confirm them *in ſome*; but *at leaſt* to afford no foundation and countenance to the aſſertions in the tranſlator's note, ſufficient for any one to maintain, that the people of *Elam and Media* in Iſaiah's own mind were not or could not be thoſe, who were ſubjects or aſſiſtants to Eſarhaddon at his acquiſition of Babylon 45 years after the delivery of the prophecy, but rather the aſſiſtants of Cyrus 200 years later. I am ſenſible however, that different perſons may ſurvey the ſame paſſages of antient authors with a very different eye, and draw different inferences from them; but ſince the caſe admits of this account with as much conſiſtency as any other, it can never eſtabliſh any ſatisfactory foundation for Iſaiah's prophecies to be accuſed of diſorderly arrangement, and of not being arranged by himſelf? Such accuſations are hereby proved to be either arguments drawn from our own ignorance of the real ſtate of things in thoſe antient times, or from miſrepreſentations of what few hiſtoric ſcraps have been preſerved, or from erroneous ſuppoſals of their having been

been different from what it is thus found they probably were, when we take the pains to collect and compare together thoſe ſcattered paſſages, which have been fortunately preſerved, and to annex the right meaning to the original words of their authors, inſtead of implicitly copying the errors of others, and adding often new miſtakes to older ones. But the misfortune is, that moſt readers are ſo indolent, as to deſire that others ſhould take the pains of thinking for them; hence they greedily follow any ſpecious narrative or criticiſms, which have been prepared for their uſe, and very few chooſe to interrupt the courſe of their amuſement in reading, by an examination into the foundation of any thing, which is either preſented to them under an agreeable form, or authorized by prevalent opinion.

As then we have thus found, that the *firſt* hiſtoric notice in theſe prophecies (viz. concerning *Elam* and *Media* being the principal agents in the invaſion of Babylon) on which the tranſlator has chiefly inſiſted, is juſt *as well* if not *better* ſuited to the time of Eſarhaddon than of Cyrus; ſo we may equally proceed to contend, that the caſe is the ſame with all remaining circumſtances of an hiſtoric kind contained in theſe prophecies againſt Babylon. For inſtance *ſe-*

condly, the total deſolation predicted againſt Babylon (ch, 13. 19.) is no leſs ſuitable to the invaſion by Eſarhaddon, than to that by Cyrus; for if it be objected, that in fact it was not totally deſtroyed at the former event, ſo neither was it at the latter; yet if hiſtory had preſerved any deſcription of the former of the two captures, we might perhaps have found, that the prophet's hyperbolic account of the deſolation cauſed there by Eſarhaddon, *might have* been nearer to the truth, than at its capture by the humane Cyrus. But although that *total deſtruction* predicted by Iſaiah was not *literally* accompliſhed at either of theſe captures, the commentators nevertheleſs have propoſed a ſolution of the objection which equally applies to both caſes, by ſuppoſing that it was indeed meant to be *literally* accompliſhed at ſome time or other, yet only *by degrees* between that time and the Roman Empire: this ſolution therefore I may admit along with the tranſlator. But at the ſame time I cannot but take notice of a kind of inconſiſtency between his method of explaining this prediction and that in ver. 10. before: for that foregoing one he conſiders as not being meant by Iſaiah *literally*, but only as being an hyperbolic and poeic manner of deſcribing the great revolutions of kingdoms upon earth;

earth*; why then ſhould this total deſolation aſcribed to Babylon a few verſes afterwards be conſidered in any other light, than as a ſimilar poetic and hyperbolic deſcription? And why ſhould it be thought neceſſary to the juſtification of Iſaiah here, to ſhew that every title of it was literally accompliſhed *at laſt*, although indeed not in a leſs period than of 1500 years†? Does not the *ſimplex duntaxat & unum* ſeem to be

* "The Hebrew poets to expreſs proſperity and the advancement of kingdoms, make uſe of images taken from the heavenly bodies; the moon becomes like the meridian ſun, and the ſun's light is augmented ſevenfold; new heavens and a new earth are created: (ſee Iſ. xxx. 26.) on the contrary the overthrow and deſtruction of kingdoms is repreſented by oppoſite images, the ſtars are obſcured, the moon withdraws her light, and the ſun ſhines no more; the earth quakes and the heavens tremble, and all things ſeem tending to their original chaos." See Joel, Amos, &c. *Tranſl.* 13. 10.

† "Babylon was riſing in glory, while Iſaiah was denouncing its *utter* deſtruction—I will here mention the ſeveral ſteps by which this remarkable prophecy was *at length* accompliſhed in the total ruin of it—Cyrus took the city—which was the *firſt* ſtep to its ruin—Darius Hyſtaſpis puniſhed it for a revolt, and demoliſhed the gates. Xerxes deſtroyed the temple of Belus. The building of Seleucia exhauſted Babylon of its inhabitants.—A king of the Parthians burnt and deſtroyed the moſt beautiful parts of the city—The neglect of the Macedonians nearly compleated its deſtruction. Jerom ſays, the walls only

ſerved

wanting here*? However we are at leaſt certain, that by the tranſlator's method of expoſition in enumerating all the revolutions and deſolations incident to Babylon, from firſt to laſt, we muſt indubitably hit ſomewhere among them upon that identical one in Iſaiah's mind: and for this very reaſon it ſeems the more neceſſary, that the very firſt invaſion of Babylon on record, and one the neareſt to the days of Iſaiah, if not actually accompliſhed before his death, ought not to have been omitted in the tranſlator's long catalogue of Babyloniſh calamities; but to have ſtood at the head of it, leſt after all we ſhould by this omiſſion happen to miſs of that very deſolation, which was principally and moſt probably in the prophet's view; and urged by him both as an inſtructive leſſon to the Jews, cotemporaries to himſelf and this event, and alſo as a proof of his own veracity concerning his prediction of

ſerved for the encloſure of a park for the king's hunting—modern travellers have ſcarcely been able to find the remains of it. It is ſo *utterly* annihilated, that even the place where this wonder ſtood, cannot be now determined." *Tranſl.* 13. 21.

* Moreover, as Le Clerc obſerves, Prendre les expreſſions des poetes à la lettre, c'eſt les reduire à un ſens, qu'ils n'ont point eu en vue & leur faire dire ce à quoi ils n'ont jamais penſè. *Bibl. anc. et mod. tom.* 7. *p.* 244.

the

the *more diſtant* fall of the Aſſyrian empire at Nineveh about 87 years later. Beſides this cuſtomary manner of explaining the accompliſhment of prophecies, by maintaining that ſuch parts of them as are not fully accompliſhed by any one event, are nevertheleſs literally accompliſhed *by degrees* at different ſucceeding events in later ages; there is alſo another manner of explication, often adopted by the tranſlator and others, which is, by conſidering the literal accompliſhment of a prophecy by any one hiſtoric event, as being moreover a *typical* prefiguration of ſome other more diſtant event*: in this ſenſe then, Iſaiah's prophecy of Eſarhaddon's invaſion of Babylon, though literally accompliſhed by that event, yet might

* "The redemption from Babylon is in ch. 40 clearly foretold; and at the ſame time is employed as an image to ſhadow out a redemption of an higher nature—if the literal ſenſe of this prophecy, as above explained, cannot be queſtioned, much leſs can the ſpiritual; which, I think, is allowed on all hands, even by Grotius himſelf: if both are to be admitted, here is a plain example of the myſtical allegory, or double ſenſe, as it is commonly called, of prophecy; which the ſacred writers of the New Teſtament clearly ſuppoſe, and according to which they frequently frame their interpretation of the Old Teſtament. Of the foundation and properties of this allegory ſee *de ſacr. Poeſ. Hebr. prælect.* 11." *Tranſl. ch.* 49. 1.

never-

nevertheleſs be prefigurative of Cyrus's ſubſequent capture of the ſame city, juſt as well as the delivery from Babylon is conſidered as typical of the redemption by the Meſſiah. But concerning theſe typical accompliſhments of the Jewiſh prophecies, I have already declared in my introduction (p. 117.) that they do not enter into the plan of my enquiries relative to theſe ſubjects, which are confined to critical and not myſtical inveſtigations; for I have propoſed ſolely to ſearch out the primary events in each prophet's mind and view in the moſt literal manner poſſible, with their attendant circumſtances: which although it may not be the moſt important matter of enquiry, muſt nevertheleſs be the firſt in order of examination, and a neceſſary foundation to all others; for until we are able to aſcertain what the event is, which is to ſerve as a type of ſome later one, we cannot well pretend to determine concerning the event conceived to be typified by it; the latter I leave to each perſon's own application, according to his own judgment and conſcience. I need only to obſerve then in regard to ſuch typical ſenſes, that by a literal one being in a prophet's mind and view, I do not mean to aſſert, that a typical one alſo was not: but only that at leaſt the former was in his mind,

mind, and that ſo the latter might have been alſo for any thing we know to the contrary: for although we know, that in ſome caſes thoſe prophets, who have been ſpeaking literally of ſome one hiſtoric event, have at the ſame time, without being conſcious of it, delivered what they ſaid in a prophetic manner, as a type of ſome other event very different from what they had then immediately in their own mind and view; as in the caſe of Caiaphas in John 11. 50.; yet in other caſes perhaps they may have been conſcious of the double ſenſe of their own prophetic words, and that they had both a literal and typical application. It was then in conformity to this confined plan of my enquiries, that I only pointed out at p. 317 the object in Iſaiah's mind at his delivery of his 11th chapter, to have been a prediction of the happy termination, which Hezekiah put to the civil wars between Judah and Iſrael; yet this literal object of that prophecy, does not prevent but that it might alſo, either with his knowledge or without, be predictive likewiſe in a typical manner of the happy concord, which the kingdom of Chriſt ſhould have a tendency to produce among its true votaries. In like manner the hiſtoric object literally in Iſaiah's view in his 53d chapter, was to repreſent the ſufferings in-

flicted on the Jewiſh ſtate in general, on account of the idolatrous tranſgreſſions of their kings, and of many individuals, agreeably to the well known remark of Horace, "Quicquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi." This Jewiſh ſtate is ſometimes ſtiled the Son, which God brought out of Egypt; in ch. lii. 13. Iſaiah calls it God's ſervant, and again in ch. liii. 11; but in ver. 3. it is repreſented under the idea of a man of ſorrows, who hath borne their griefs, was wounded for their tranſgreſſions, and bruiſed for their iniquities: but this literal ſenſe does not prevent, it rather lays a ſurer foundation for its typical ſenſe relative to the Meſſiah; by preparing us the better to comprehend how great a mercy it would be to mankind for a righteous individual to be able to make ſatisfaction, by his ſufferings, for the ſins of the whole community, rather than according to the literal ſenſe, for the whole community to ſuffer for the ſins of ſeveral individuals. If then at ch. liii. the tranſlator has not thus repreſented the ſufferings of the Jewiſh ſtate at Babylon to be typical of the ſufferings of the Meſſiah, juſt as well as the redemption of that ſtate from Babylon to be typical of the redemption of mankind, does not the *ſimplex & unum* ſeem to be again wanting here? The literal ſenſe moreover

which

which I have pointed out at p. 286. in the note concerning a paſſage in Micah, does not any way prevent its being alſo, in like manner, typical of the Meſſiah. Grotius was the firſt who diſtinguiſhed himſelf by illuſtrating the literal and hiſtoric meaning of the prophecies; this method was for ſome time reprobated by many zealous authors, particularly by Boſſuet and Vitringa, one a Papiſt and one a Proteſtant; but it was defended by Hammond*, by Le Clerc, by Warburton, and the tranſlator; and it has been of late generally admitted not only by Proteſtants, but alſo by many learned Papiſts, particularly by the celebrated Pezron Dr. of Theology at Paris, in an *Eſſay concerning a literal and hiſtoric Commentary on the Prophets*; the execution of which, if it had been equal to the excellence of the deſign, might have poſſibly rendered my own unneceſſary: but the explication, which he gives of the firſt chapter of Iſaiah, by means of a ſuppoſed irruption of the Scythians, may ſerve as a ſpecimen of the romance, which is to be found in moſt other parts of it. The public therefore muſt judge, whe-

* See his works, vol. 2. in Tracts againſt Dr. Owen.—Bibl. choiſ. tom. 5. p. 305. and tom. 27. p. 378. by Le Clerc.

ther the method I have adopted will not ſupply us with ſurer means of arriving at this object in view, the literal and hiſtoric ſenſe, and with more certainty than Grotius and Pezron have attained to, that is, by aſcertaining better the connection between prophane and ſacred chronology, and by aſcertaining alſo the arrangement and connection of the ſeveral predictions with each other, and with the hiſtoric relations of their accompliſhment as given us in the prophetic books*. Theſe I have proved to be the work of the prophets themſelves by ſuch evidence, as has been always thought ſatisfactory with reſpect to prophane authors; that is, by ſhewing that thoſe narrative paſſages, which Simon conſiders as additions, if not interpolations by other hands, intended to open to us the deſign of ſeveral predictions, are in reality hiſtoric relations of their actual accompliſhment: they muſt be therefore com-

* The learned Origen alſo appears to have been in the ſame error with Jerom and the moderns concerning the diſorder and want of connection throughout the prophetic books "Εστι δε αὐτη συνηθεια της γραφης, το ταχεως μεταπηδαν απο του περι τινων λογου εις τον περι ἑτερων, και τελο ασαφως ποιειν και συνκεχυμενως μαλιστα τους προφητας. Eſt autem is ſcripturæ mos, ut ab uno ſermone ad alium illico tranſiliat, idque *obſcure et confuſe* admodum prophetæ faciunt. *Orig. Fragm. Comment. in Cantic.*" *Edit. Huet. tom. i. p.* 52.

poſed

poſed indeed after their accompliſhment; but as they contain no reference or alluſion to any later hiſtoric events, than ſuch as the prophets reſpectively might have lived to ſee; this circumſtance, at the ſame time that it proves the prophets not to have put a finiſhing hand to the *compilation* of their reſpective prophetic books until their old age, proves alſo that there is not the leaſt juſtifiable pretence for Simon or others, to attribute theſe hiſtoric relations and the preſent order of compilation to any other hands than thoſe of the prophets themſelves*. But ſince the abovementioned authors, who have defended the neceſſity of ſuch enquiries as theſe into the literal and hiſtoric accompliſhment of prophecies, have been chiefly of the proteſtant church (for Grotius was a ſort of neutral) it may be proper to ſubjoin extracts from the preface to that work of Pezron, to ſhew, that in this point the learned of all religious ſects agree, and unite in juſtifying the expediency of ſuch hiſtoric en-

* Tout conviennent qu' Iſaie a commencé *fort jeune* a porter aux peuples la parole du Seigneur; qu' il l'a annoncée *tres long temps*, c'eſt à dire, ſous 4 ou 5 Rois; et ſelon la chronique d'Alexandrie (p. 276.) ç'a été durant le cours de 90 ans: ſa mort n'eſt arrivée que vers les commencemens du regne de Manaſſes." *Pezron p.* 295,

quiries,

quiries, in order to lay a more ſolid foundation for the right explanation of prophecies typical of the Meſſiah; his apology then may ſerve as my own * : for ſuch hiſtoric explications of the accompliſhment of the ſe-

* *Preface.* " Tous les Chrétiens auſſi bien que les Juifs reconnoiſent avec foi reſpectueuſe l'autorité divinede les prophetes inſpirez: il n'y a que les libertins et les incredules, qui balance la deſſus; parce qu'ils ne regle la verité de la prophetie que par leur propre ſens, et par la portée de leur eſprit. Il arrive ſouvent, qu' apres avoir tourne, et pour ainſi dire, baloté dans leurs têtes les plus importantes prédictions, ſans les pouvoir entendre, et ſans en decouvrir l'accompliſſement, ils les regardent comme douteuſes et incertaines, parce qu'elles ſont obſcures et difficiles. Mais ils ſe trompent dans leurs idées, et leur égarement vient de ce qu'ils ne jugent de ces ſacrez oracles, que par l'obſcurité qui les environne, et par l'embarras qu'ils ont à en verifier les événements. Oſeroit on dire, qu'il n'y ait que les eſprits libertins, qui doutent quelquefois, ou du moins qui vacillent ſur la verité des propheties? Non, on ne l'oſeroit dire: car combien voit-on des Chrétiens, qui ont le cœur droit et l'eſprit ſoumis qui ne laiſſent pas d'etre agitez de mille penſées differentes, et milles idées aſſez peu favorables, quand ils ſortent de deſſus ces livres ſacrez? Ils ſont perſuadez que ces livres renferment de grandes veritez; ils cherchent même avec ardeur à les découvrir, et cependant elles demeurent cachées. La plupart des prophéties ſont voilées pour eux; ce ſont des énigmes, ce ſont des myſteres qu'ils ne ſçauroient penetrer. Combien de rebuts ſouffre l'eſprit humain par le poids et la grandeur de ces difficultez? Et parmi ces rebuts combien de vacillations et d'incertitudes, ou tout au moins combien des dégouts? Il faut que je confeſſe

veral prophecies are, as Pezron juſtly obſerves, conſiderable proofs againſt the objection of free-thinkers concerning the want

confeſſe, que j'en ai moi-meme beaucoup eſſuyé, quand je me ſuis attaché à cette étude ſainte, qui m'a paru longtemps penible: mais une application conſtante a enfin levé une grande partie de mes difficultez. Que j'eſtimerois apres cela mon travail heureux pour diſſiper les nuages des autres, et pour donner quelque jour aux paroles des prophetes. Si je n'ai pas cet avantage, on ne me pourra pas au moins reprocher d'y avoir jetté de nouvelles tenebres, ce que arrive aſſez ſouvent à ceux, qui entreprennent de faire des commentaires. L'on verra dans ceux-ci un ordre tout nouveau, qui n'a point été uſité dans ce gendre d'ecrire: j'y ſuivrai les temps, et ſi je puis même les années, auxquelles les prophétes ont annoncé les verites ſaintes, renfermées dans leurs livres—L'ordre naturel des propheties ſelon le temps qu'elles ont eté publiées, leur donnera en beaucoup d'endroits une clarté ſi grande, qu'on en ſera ſurpris—de tant des interpretes et de commentateurs, ou eſt celui qui a diſtinctement obſervé des choſes ſi utiles et ſi importantes? Car y a-t-il rien qui donne une plus grande idée des prophetes, que de voir toutes leurs predictions accomplies par une ſuite des faits et des evenements? Mais ce qui eſt encore à remarquer, ces evenements ſe ſont ſuivis *de ſi pres, qu'un prophete les a tous vûs arriver de ſon temps.* Et j'ai lieu de croire, que l'on reſtera convaincu par ce que je donne ici, quoique peu de choſe à l'egard de tout le corps des prophétes, que le ſens litteral et hiſtorique d'un grand nombre de leurs predictions, n'a pas encore été aſſez dévelopé, quelque ſoin qu'on ait pris là-deſſus, dans tant de livres et des commentaires. Que ſi l'on en demande la raiſon, il me ſemble qu'il y en a deux. La premiere eſt qu'on a beaucoup donné

au

of ſufficient authenticity in the prophetic books; and this, even if the ſuppoſition of

au ſens ſpirituel et allegorique, parce que, outre qu'il eſt tres neceſſaire, c'eſt qu'il eſt beaucoup plus facile que celui de la lettre, qui eſt ſouvent tres obſcur, comme on en peut juger par l'embarras ou ſe trouvent les commentateurs. L'autre raiſon eſt, qu'ils n'ont point aſſez travaillé à s'inſtruire de ce qui s'eſt paſſé dans l'Aſie du temps des prophétes. L'Hiſtoire des rois de ce temps là, principalement de ceux de Ninive et de Babylone, donne des lumieres incroyables pour le denouement de leurs propheties. Et quoiques nous n'en ayons que quelques petites parcelles, et quelques fragmens tres legers, ces petits reſtes ſont plus eſtimables, que tout ce qu'il y à de plus rare. L'on en jugera mieux par la jour qu'ils donneront aux endroits des propheties les plus obſcurs. p. 10.—Peutetre que ces recherches paroitront aſſez peu utiles à quelques myſtiques, qui ne veulent dans les ecritures que des ſens ſpirituels et allegoriques; mais ſi c'eſt là leur gout, ce n'eſt pas celui de tout le monde. Ils doivent ſe perſuader, qu'il y à peu de gens dans le ſiecle ou nous ſommes, qui n'aiment le ſens naturel et litteral des oracles ſacrez: ce ſens eſt ſi important, que c'eſt par lui ſeul qu'on peut convaincre les juifs, qu'ils ſont dans l'erreur et dans l'egarement. Que n'ont ils pas dit au temps de ſaint Jerome, et que ne diſſent-ils pas encore aujourd'hui de Gog et Magog; ces idées fabuleuſes ne laiſſent pas de les arreter; ils fondent la deſſus de grandes eſperances, dont ils flattent leurs peuples. *Judæi* (dit St. Jerome) *et noſtri Judaizantes* (ce ſont les Chrétiens imbus de leurs erreurs) *putant Gog et Magog gentes eſſe Scythicas immanes, et has poſt mille annorum regnum eſſe a diabolo commovendas, quæ veniant in terram Iſrael, ut pugnent contra ſanctos. Comment. Ezech.* 38. Qu'on faſſe

Simon were to be admitted, that the hiſtoric narrations concerning the accompliſhment of prophecies were added afterwards by collectors of thoſe predictions: becauſe it would ſtill appear that they were added very ſoon after the predictions were accompliſhed; and therefore there can be little room to ſuſpect any impoſition in regard to the predictions themſelves, ſince both the one and the other muſt have been ſo very antient as to be cotemporary with the times in queſtion.

The above reference of Pezron to the *Alexandrine Chronicle*, or as it is ſtyled by it's laſt editor *Du Freſne*, the *Paſchal Chronicle*, deſerves ſome diſcuſſion; for the dates there will be found remarkably to confirm from tradition thoſe very concluſions, to which I have arrived from examination of the text of Iſaiah himſelf. Pezron's reference is to ſome more antient edition; in *Du Freſne*'s laſt edition (1688) the paſſage referred

faſſe tout ce que l'on voudra, on ne les convaincra jamais, que par le ſens propre et naturel de la prophetie: les interpretations litterales et hiſtoriques ſont donc tres utiles et importantes." *p.* 286, *&c. Paris.* 1693.

"There are prophecies, which intimate a great ſlaughter of the enemies of God and his people, which remain to be fulfilled: theſe in Ezechiel, ch. 38, and in Revelat. ch. 20, are called Gog and Magog. This prophecy of Iſaiah may poſſibly refer to the ſame or the like event." *Tranſlator, ch.* 63. *n.* 1.

to is at the bottom of p. 117, and in the following words. Και Ολυμπιας—ιη, ιθ, κ, κα. Ησαιας ὁ προφητης πρισθεις ὑπο Μανασσου, ελεγχομενου ὑπ' αὐτου επι ειδωλων σεβασμασι, μεταλαξε τον βιον, προφητευσας ετη εννενηκοντα και εθαψαν αὐτον ὑπο καλω δρυος Ρωγηλ, "21 Olympias—18, 19, 20, 21, [viz. regni Manaſſis] Eſaias propheta a Manaſſe ſerra diſſectus, quod ab illo de idolatria fuiſſet objurgatus, vitam cum morte commutavit, cum prophetaſſet annos 90: hunc que humo mandarunt ſubter quercum Rogel, &c.——22 Olympias———22° [Manaſſis] Manaſſem regem Juda Aſſyriorum regis exercitus principes captivum factum Babylonem abduxerunt." Now it is obſervable, that this laſt date concerning the captivity of Manaſſeh in the 22d year of his reign is the very ſame, as what the Jews have by tradition preſerved in their greater chronicle, called Seder Olam*: This renders it probable, that the author of the above ancient chriſtian chronicle derived that prior date concerning the death of Iſaiah from the ſame ſource of Jewiſh tradition; which is alſo confirmed by what follows in the original the words

* "Anno regni 22 Menaſchæ Babylonem deportatus eſt cum idolo Michæ." *chap.* 24. "Idem refertur in Jalkut ad 2 Reg. 21. f. 38." *Not. Meyer.*

Rogel,

Rogel, &c, which is in the marvellous ſtyle of Jewiſh traditions. Hence then we find, that the antient Jews themſelves had adopted the opinion (upon what authority we are ignorant) that Iſaiah was not put to death by Manaſſeh until the very year which preceded his own captivity by Eſarhaddon, namely, his 21ſt year of reign; before which Tartan and Eſarhaddon's other generals might have laid ſiege to Azotus; for this was the fifth year after Eſarhaddon's capture of Babylon. We find alſo, that they ſuppoſed him to have lived 90 years after his firſt prophecy; this was probably too many: for in order to make out ſo many years the author of the chronicle is forced to place Iſaiah's 1ſt prophecy in the 8th year before the death of Uzziah [45° anno Uzziæ Eſaias cæpit prophetare, *p.* 204] whereas the words of Iſaiah himſelf place it in the *laſt* year of Uzziah, and the ſiege of Azotus might have happened any where between the 16th and 21ſt of Manaſſeh; which reduces the period of his prophetic courſe to the poſſibility of not exceeding 78 years, conſequently his life might not have exceeded 95 or 97. The author of this Chronicle however, has placed the 22d of Manaſſeh almoſt 5 olympiads too ſoon, by making it coincide with the 22d olympiad; whereas by my *New*

Syſtem of Chronology, p. 217, it appears that it coincided with the 74th Chaldæan year, which was cotemporary with the 3d of 26th olympiad: but then he has made nearly the ſame error with reſpect to all kings of Perſia before Alexander, though not in the ſame degree; and Joſephus had committed a ſimilar miſtake before him, ſee vol. 1. at firſt line of Table, p. 351. This general error then, which runs throughout his Chronicle, does no way affect his dates of events in any Jewiſh reigns; and though thoſe 90 years of prophecy ought in truth to be reduced to 78; yet even that error proves how prevalent an opinion it was among the antient Jews, of Iſaiah's having both lived to a great age, and alſo of his having begun to prophecy very young. The cauſe of that error concerning the olympiads appears at p. 204, where the author profeſſes to follow Africanus, who as he there informs us, placed the reign of Jotham about the firſt olympiad, which is 20 years or 5 olympiads too ſoon, as may be ſeen in my Table; this neceſſarily makes all the ſubſequent events fall likewiſe 20 years too early in the æra of olympiads; but he makes the error become leſs and leſs as he approaches the age of Alexander, yet not in any equable manner; ſo that his computations of the diſtances between

tween ſacred and prophane events become liable to great errors and uncertainty; but the caſe is very different between one ſacred event and another, theſe having nothing to do with this error in the olympic dates. What led Africanus and Joſephus alſo into this error was their ſuppoſition, that the 70 years of captivity were compleated at Cyrus's acceſſion to Media, which was 20 years before his conqueſt of Babylon, therefore 20 years too ſoon; (ſee vol. 1. p. 137.) this neceſſarily made them place all prior events in ſacred hiſtory 20 years too ſoon likewiſe. But theſe errors no way affect the dates concerning the age and death of Iſaiah; in regard to which this old Chriſtian Chronicle has therefore preſerved the traditions of the antient Jews more at large, than in the oldeſt and more epitomized chronicle of the Jews now extant, the *Seder Olam*. Again, this Chriſtian Chronicle places the viſion of Iſaiah concerning Babylon in the 12th year of Achaz *, that is, near the end of his reign, agreeably to what I have contended for; whereas the tranſlator after Vitringa places it "about 200 years before its completion" by Cyrus; this ſuppoſes its delivery to have been about the third of Ahaz,

* "12° Hoc anno Eſaias viſionem de Babylone vidit." *P.* 114.

and

and therefore before ſome of the *preceding* prophecies; which introduces diſorder into the arrangement of the prophecies without any ſufficient proof, and againſt probability. So that on the whole, many of the dates, facts and circumſtances concerning Iſaiah's prophecies, which I have contended for, inſtead of being liable to objection as novelties, are, as we thus find, only old opinions revived and recovered; but not the worſe, and indeed much the better on that account; ſince they were the opinions held by Jews and Chriſtians 1500 years ago, when both various hiſtories and traditions were ſtill extant, which have now totally periſhed: Jewiſh traditions indeed are often very fabulous, yet there is often ſome truth intermixed, though obſcured by their fabulous additions. But the firſt commentators after the revival of literature, having too haſtily taken up crude opinions of their own, others too implicitly followed them, and through their authority ſuch modern errors keep their ground ſtill, although againſt reaſon and juſt criticiſm.

A *third* hiſtoric circumſtance is the return of the Jews from captivity predicted in ch. 14. 1. But any one captivity or return from it muſt of neceſſity in its leading and *general* circumſtances be ſo ſimilar to any other

reſtoration, that we can form no concluſion as to what reſtoration Iſaiah here alluded, unleſs there were alſo ſome *peculiar* circumſtances mentioned, which were remarkably ſuited to the delivery by Cyrus in preference to any other. Now this is ſo far from being the real truth, that on the contrary the tranſlator himſelf acknowledges in regard to theſe *peculiar* circumſtances, that they are no way conformable to the delivery by Cyrus; therefore he concludes, that they referred to *later* times:* but why might they not as well refer to *earlier* times? The circumſtances, to which the tranſlator alludes, are doubtleſs thoſe concerning "the ſtranger cleaving to the houſe of Jacob, who ſhould poſſeſs them for ſervants, and take them captives, whoſe captives they were, and rule over their oppreſſors." This was ſo far from being the caſe at the return of the Jews under Cyrus, that we read of no ſtrangers or *mixed* people accompanying them, and the Samaritans and ſtrangers in Paleſtine oppoſed, inſtead of being joined to them; neither did the Jews afterwards ever

* "The other circumſtances mentioned in this and the next verſe, which did not in any compleat ſenſe accompany the return from the captivity of Babylon; ſeem to intimate that this *whole* prophecy extends its views beyond that event." *Ch.* 14. 1.

rule

rule over them. Jerom therefore appears alſo to have been puzzled how to apply theſe circumſtances to the return under Cyrus*; and I know of no commentator, who has given a tolerable ſolution of the difficulty: the reaſon of which very probably is, becauſe they have applied to the delivery by Cyrus, a paſſage which had no relation to it, but perhaps to an *earlier* delivery of ſuch captives belonging to the kingdom of Iſrael, as were found priſoners at Babylon, when Eſarhaddon poſſeſſed himſelf of it; and who were permitted by him to return home along with the Babylonians, Cuthites, and other captives of Eſarhaddon, whom he ſent to people Samaria. Both Pul and Tiglah had carried away part of the kingdom of Iſrael into captivity; where they were ſent is not expreſsly mentioned in ſcripture; yet it contains ſome indirect evidence, that a part of them were ſent to Babylon; which was then under the controul of thoſe Aſſyrian kings.†

* In hoc ſolum artari videtur intelligentia, quomodo poſſederint Iſrael in terra domini victores quondam ſuos, ſervos que eos habuerint et ancillas. *Comment. c.* 14.

† The lateſt date, at which Tiglah is mentioned in ſcripture is about the 1ſt of Ahaz, which was the 16th before Hezekiah; he was plainly dead before the 12th of Ahaz, for then Shalmanaſſar came againſt Hoſhea: but the 16th before Hezekiah, was the 7th

of

For in Iſaiah ch. xi. 11. he predicts, that after the misfortunes, which ſhould fall upon the Aſſyrians under Sennacherib, the Jewiſh captives ſhould return home from all parts, from a *variety* of different and diſtant places, and likewiſe *from Elam and from Shinar*; by Shinar it is allowed, that Babylon is meant, built in the plain of Shinar: ſome of the Iſraelites therefore taken away by Pul and Tiglah, muſt have been ſent to Elam and Babylon *. Iſaiah, moreover, could not well mean here merely the return of the captives of Judah from Babylon under Cyrus; becauſe he ſeems rather to ſpeak of ſuch as were captives already, before he delivered this prophecy, which he repeats to the ſame purport at v. 16. All the concomitant circumſtances, in like manner, point

of Nabonaſſar, 8 years before his death; therefore in the 1ſt of Ahaz, when Tiglah carried away his lateſt captives from Iſrael in his expedition againſt Pekah, Nabonaſſar very probably might have not then rendered himſelf independant of Tiglah, ſo that the latter might have placed ſome of his Iſraelitiſh captives in Babylon, as well as Pul at a ſtill earlier period.

* It is obſervable, that in Dow's Hiſtory of Indoſtan, mention is made of a barbarous nation dwelling in the mountains between Perſia and India, who had preſerved a tradition of their having been originally captives, ſent there from Phenicia: they might be remains of Jews, or ſome other people of Paleſtine tranſplanted by the kings of Aſſyria.

to ſome more immediate redemption from captivity, than that diſtant one under Cyrus; for it was apparently to happen while *Aſſyria* and *Elam* were ſtill exiſting as kingdoms, which they were not in the age of Cyrus; and alſo, it was apparently to happen about the ſame time, when the other concomitant events were to happen, ſuch as the calamities to the Aſſyrians under Sennacherib in v. 10. thoſe to Edom, Moab and the Philiſtines, under Hezekiah in v. 14, and to Egypt in v. 15. by Sennacherib; and moreover, while either the kingdom of Ephraim or Judah, or both, were ſtill exiſting as in v. 13. both of which were extinct at the time of Cyrus. That Iſaiah ſhould intermix among theſe events of his own time, deſcriptive of the happy age of Hezekiah, a prediction of ſuch a diſtant event as the return under Cyrus; and, that he ſhould mean alſo by *out-caſts* and *diſperſed*, not ſuch as *were* already under that calamity, but ſuch as *ſhould be* afterwards carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar; this is to deſtroy the connection in the ideas of the writer, and to put a forced ſenſe upon his words without any ſufficient foundation, and apparently againſt his intention. This gives a preſumption then, that he meant ſome return of the Jews from captivity, nearer to his own times; and this preſump-

preſumption is confirmed at ch. 14.; where we again, and ſo ſoon after the former, meet with another prediction of a return of the Jews from the captivity; the circumſtances of which, are ſuch, that even the tranſlator himſelf acknowledges, they are not all ſuitable to the return under Cyrus: why then ſhould it be pronounced without heſitation, that they referred to ſome *later* delivery, rather than to ſome *earlier* one; and why, on the contrary, ſhould we heſitate at all in applying theſe predictions to the event of Eſarhaddon's earlier capture of Babylon; to which all the circumſtances are ſo ſuitable, that they lead us, as it were by the hand, directly to this event? for one of theſe prophecies immediately precedes Iſaiah's prediction of the capture of Babylon by the Medes under Eſarhaddon in ch. 13, and the other is inſerted in the midſt of it. Mere juxtapoſition in arrangement, implies at leaſt ſome connection in the ideas of the writer; and a connection in his ideas, implies ſome connection in theſe events thus ſucceſſively predicted by him: but we have more than mere juxtapoſition in favour of this application; for the return of the Jews predicted in ch. 14, ſeems introduced by him, as if it were mentioned as the natural and neceſſary conſequence of *that* capture of Ba-

bylon predicted immediately before; and that was apparently effected by Esarhaddon: "Babylon shall be overthrown by the Medes;—her time is at hand, and her days shall not be prolonged;—for the Lord will have mercy on Israel, and will yet set him in his own land." If we ascribe *this* capture to Esarhaddon, we cannot but ascribe the subsequent delivery of the Jews to the same king and event: they are plainly mentioned as dependent on each other; and in fact, the circumstances in the prophecies of these two events, will be found to be such, as reciprocally add confirmation to this explication of each. For that part of the prophecy addressed to Israel: "The stranger shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob, &c." was no way fulfilled at the delivery by Cyrus; on the contrary, the Samaritans, and others, then were leagued together against the delivered Jews, and opposed them: but when Esarhaddon took Babylon, we are certain, that he sent Babylonians and parties of several other nations, whom he had probably made prisoners there, to repeople Samaria; and these became dependent on Judah, both in religious and in civil affairs, as long as the kingdom of Judah existed; so that it might be strictly said of them, that they became captives,

captives, and ſervants and handmaids, to the Jews of the kingdom of Judah, who hereby ruled over ſome of thoſe very Babylonians who had oppreſſed the Iſraelites while captives at Babylon. That this Babylonian colony was inſtructed in the Jewiſh religion, we know from 2 K. 17. 28, where we read, that Eſarhaddon ſent Jewiſh prieſts from Babylon to Bethel in the tribe of Ephraim, and belonging to the late kingdom of Iſrael, in order to teach them the Jewiſh law: that they were under the civil government of the kingdom of Judah is evident from ſeveral acts of Joſiah, which imply juriſdiction over Samaria. We read in 2 Kings, that Joſiah "not only deſtroyed the altar in Bethel, but alſo the high places, which were in the cities of Samaria, and ſlew all the prieſts of the high places, that were there," xxiii. 15. 19. 20. In 2 Chr. it is added, that Joſiah "brake down all the altars, groves and images in the cities of Manaſſeh, Ephraim and Simeon even unto Naphtali and throughout the land of Iſrael," 34. 6. "And that the Levites gathered money throughout Manaſſeh and Ephraim, and all the remnant of Iſrael---and *made* all that were preſent in Iſrael to ſerve the Lord," ver. 9 and 33. But after the return of the Jews under Cyrus, theſe Samaritans became an independant

pendant people, and the above circumſtances in the prophecy were afterwards no longer applicable to them. As Jewiſh prieſts were ſent by the king from Babylon into Samaria, ſo it is no way improbable but that other priſoners of the kingdom of Iſrael were permitted to return to Samaria about that time both from Babylon now conquered by Eſarhaddon, and alſo from the cities of the Medes; where we find from the book of Tobit many Iſraelites had been placed, and where there would no longer be the ſame zeal to detain them, now that the Medes had rendered themſelves independent of Eſarhaddon and the kingdom of Aſſyria at Niniveh. If the fact of ſuch a permiſſion to return is not particularly related in ſcripture, it is probably becauſe the hiſtoric relations there are both very brief and imperfect; and becauſe theſe ſcattered returns of individuals out of captivity from different and very diſtant places, and at different times, and thro' different cauſes, might not appear ſufficiently important events to the hiſtoric authors: but that this was the real fact, we have great reaſon to preſume from theſe two prophecies of Iſaiah in ch. xi. 11. and xiv. 1. the former of which promiſes ſuch a general delivery both from Babylon and other diſtant places; and the latter fixes part of it

as

as about to happen immediately after the capture of Babylon by Eſarhaddon, and even in conſequence of that event, and accompanied with ſuch circumſtances as were ſuitable to no later period of time. So that this laſt prophecy alſo was fulfilled before the death of Iſaiah: but if any perſon ſhould, notwithſtanding what has been urged, rather prefer to conſider theſe words, "the Lord will yet have mercy on Iſrael and ſet them in their own land," as referring to ſome *later* delivery, either that under Cyrus or ſome other, yet this does not ſeem to prevent but that the ſubſequent words may nevertheleſs refer to the caſe of the colony of Babylonians, who were ſent into Samaria after Eſarhaddon's capture of Babylon, although the return of the Jews themſelves ſhould not have been accompliſhed until the later capture of that city by Cyrus.

A *fourth* circumſtance worthy of obſervation is, that throughout this prophecy againſt Babylon in both the 13th, 14th and 21ſt chapters, no paſſage occurs, which can in any obvious conſtruction imply, that the Babylonians had at that time, or ſhould at any time afterwards, *before* the deſtruction here denounced againſt them, have any wars with, or make any invaſion into Judæa or Paleſtine. Now at the time of Eſarhaddon's capture of Baby-

Babylon that was indeed the real fact; for the Babylonians had then never invaded nor any way diſtreſſed the Jews; but during the time of Nabuchadnezzar the Babylonians had been the ſevereſt enemies to the Jews: if then this prophecy had referred to ſo *late* a time, we might have expected to have met with ſome ſuch reproaches againſt them for their military deſolations, as could not have admitted of any other meaning, than that they had perſonally deſtroyed Jeruſalem, or invaded Zion or Paleſtine in general. Such *particular* reproaches as theſe could not well have referred to any *earlier* time than that of Nebuchadnezzar, he being the firſt Babylonian king who had ſeverely diſtreſſed Paleſtine with an army: accordingly we meet with repeated bitter reproaches of this kind in Jeremiah and Ezechiel againſt the conduct of the Babylonians to the Jews, under Nebuchadnezzar, and in Iſaiah alſo againſt the Aſſyrians under Sennacherib, and even againſt the Babylonians in thoſe chapters after the xxxixth, which in reality prophecy concerning Nebuchadnezzar's invaſion *; but nothing of this kind occurs in

* "I was wroth with my people, I have given them into thine hand; thou didſt ſhew them no mercy," xlvii. 6. "Jeruſalem is a deſolation." Our holy houſe, where our fathers praiſed thee, is burnt with fire, and all our pleaſant things are laid waſte.". lxiv. 10. and 11.

theſe

theſe three chapters under conſideration againſt the Babylonians, which conveys the leaſt idea of any military invaſion of Judæa by them: they are only reproached for *oppreſſing* thoſe, who were placed captives among them; and for not *opening* the houſe of their priſoners, (v. 17.) but not a word about burning the temple, and laying waſte Judæa or Jeruſalem. In the words "He who ſmote the people in wrath," *people* is explained immediately after, to mean the *nations of the heathen*, and not *my people* of Iſrael. Again, "ſince thou art laid down no feller is come up againſt the cedars of Lebanon," is explained by Lowth and all others not to mean military fellers of cedars, as in ch. x. 34; but thoſe workmen, who felled cedars to be conveyed down the Euphrates to Babylon to build Palaces there, and who by its deſtruction loſt their employment. All alluſions to military operations, ſuch as "making the world a wilderneſs and deſtroying the cities thereof," are expreſſed in ſuch general terms, that they cannot, without diſtortion, be made to mean Judæa and Paleſtine in particular, but rather the cities of the Aſſyrians and Medes; whom Iſaiah repeatedly and immediately after calls the *kings of the nations*, and between whom and the Babylonians there had been conti-

nual wars, more particularly under Nabonaſſar, a little before the delivery of this prophecy. I know of only this one following paſſage, which can be miſconſtrued into an intimation of any invaſion of Judæa, "I will exalt my throne above the ſtars of God; I will ſit alſo upon the mount of the congregation in the ſides of the north, I will aſcend above the clouds." *v.* 13. In this hyperbolic gaſconade, which Iſaiah puts into the mouth of the king of Babylon, the tranſlator agrees with Jerom and other commentators, "that by the *mount of the congregation in the ſides of the north* he means Jeruſalem, which was ſaid to be built on the north ſide of Mount Zion, and which ſometimes is, or may be called the mount of the tabernacle, or place of meeting between Moſes and the divine Preſence." Thus it is, that juſt as the bias of a bowl makes it always incline to one ſide, ſo a pre-conception, that this prophecy refers to Nebuchadnezzar's exploits, makes the commentators find every ambiguous expreſſion tend toward Jeruſalem. But if we ſhould even grant what they contend for here, yet this threat, that he would ſit upon Mount Zion, may be conſidered in no other light, than as a mere gaſconade of a ſimilar nature to thoſe others concerning his ſcaling the ſtars, and aſcending

above

above the clouds; it can never be inferred from this threat that Iſaiah had in his view, the actual invaſion of Nebuchadnezzar, who really was deſtined to take poſſeſſion of Mount Zion: but the concomitant parts of the boaſt rather ſhew, that Iſaiah himſelf conſidered it to be an act as little probable as aſcending the heavens; if indeed he had any idea at all concerning *Mount Zion* in this paſſage; which as I conceive, he had not. The united army of the Medes, Aſſyrians, and Perſians, againſt Babylon, is frequently repreſented as an *aſſembly* or *congregation* of people from the north; it is the very idea with which Iſaiah begins this prophecy*, and he might intend here juſt as well to deſcribe Eſarhaddon's army, as that of Cyrus: the ſituation of Aſſyria and Media on the north of Babylon, and Media by being a mountainous country, give in either caſe an expreſſive Propriety to theſe appellations.

* "The noiſe of a multitude in the *mountains*, of kingdoms and nations *gathered* together, they come from a far country, from the end of heaven," So alſo Jeremiah "I will cauſe to come up againſt Babylon an *aſſembly* of great nations from the *north country*." 50. 9. In like manner when Cyaxares with his Medes, joined the army of Nebuchaduezzar againſt Judah, Jeremiah calls this union "All the *families of the north*, and Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon againſt the land of Judah." 25. 9.

It is then probably to *ſome one* of the *appointed meetings* of theſe nations on the *mountains* to the north of Babylon, in their wars againſt it, that the prophet alludes in this 13th verſe, and not to the place of *appointed meeting* between Moſes and the divine Preſence on Mount Zion: he only makes the King of Babylon to boaſt, that he will get poſſeſſion of thoſe mountains in the north quarters, where his wonted enemies the Medes and Aſſyrians were accuſtomed to appoint the aſſembly of their armies, and from which they iſſued to invade the Babylonians. The Hebrew word tranſlated there by *congregation*, more properly, as the learned tranſlator obſerves, means *appointment*; and in this ſenſe the ſame word is uſed in Job xxx. 23; where the grave is ſtyled "the houſe of appointment for all living." In Joſhua alſo the ſame word occurs, when the cities of refuge are called the "cities of appointment for all the children of Iſrael." xx. 9. There is nothing then in the mere phraſe itſelf, "mountain of appointment" which can any way indicate, that it refers to an *appointment* on Mount Zion, rather than to one on any other mountain. As *appointments* are generally previous to *meetings*, the ſame Hebrew word ſometimes includes the latter ſenſe: thus in Nehemiah, "Sanballat and

Geſhem

Geſhem ſent to me, ſaying, come, let us *meet* together." vi. 2. Again in Joſhua, "when all theſe kings were *aſſembled together by appointment*, they came and pitched at the waters of Merom to fight againſt Iſrael." xi. 5. Here we find, that the ſame word is expreſſly applied to the *appointed rendezvous* of an army of different nations, previous to their entering upon action; and the ſame is probably its right ſenſe in the paſſage of Iſaiah under conſideration, without its having the leaſt reference to Mount Zion, or to this being a place of appointment between Moſes and the divine Preſence. Add to this, that I cannot find any place in ſcripture, where Mount Zion is in fact ever called "the Mount of Appointment:" ſo that this conſtruction, which Jerom ſtarted, ſeems to have been only a gloſs of the Rabbins, who taught him Hebrew: the Septuagint tranſlators had no idea of it; for they render the paſſage agreeably to myſelf, Καθιω εν ορει ὑψηλω επι τα ορη τα υψηλα τα προς Βορραν. The paſſages to which the tranſlator refers (Ex. 25, 22, and 29, 42, 43.) reſpect only the ark and tabernacle; therefore cannot include any idea of Mount Zion, except by a very remote implication: it is called "the Mount of the Daughter of Zion, the Holy Mount of Jeruſalem, the Mount of the Lord's Houſe, the

the Mount of Holineſs, the Mount of the height of Iſrael," but no where, "the Mount of Appointment, or of the Congregation."

A *fifth* hiſtoric circumſtance is contained in the prediction, "that the Lord will cut off from Babylon, the name and remnant, and ſon and nephew," *v.* 22. Theſe words all the commentators apply to the deſcendants of Nebuchadnezzar, and conſider as accompliſhed in them: but ſince the Chaldean æra, and Beroſus in Joſephus, allow of four ſucceſſors to Nebuchadnezzar, whereas the ſcripture mentions only two, Belſhazzar and Evil Merodach; they have differed and been perplexed in determining which of theſe was the ſon, and which the nephew. But they might have ſpared themſelves this trouble; for there is no ſufficient indication, nor even probability, that theſe words of Iſaiah have any reference whatever to any one of the deſcendants of Nebuchadnezzar; but rather to ſome of the deſcendants of Beleſis, the firſt race of Aſſyrian kings at Babylon: whoſe poſterity, as Iſaiah here predicts, was to be expelled, or extinguiſhed by Eſarhaddon at his conqueſt of Babylon; or by a rebellion and anarchy, which had ſubſiſted there eight years before Eſarhaddon's expedition againſt it. So that theſe words in like manner may juſt as well refer to the one event as to the other.

The

The *laſt* circumſtance, of which there is occaſion to take notice, is, what the illuſtrious annotator has himſelf ſuggeſted; namely, that it ſeems extraordinary, that Iſaiah ſhould in the beginning of ch. xiv. predict the delivery of the Jews from Babylon by Cyrus, although he has not predicted their captivity there*. Now does not this circumſtance ſeem to add confirmation, that Isaiah did not probably mean the delivery of the Jews from Babylon after their captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, (becauſe that *captivity*, as well as *reſtoration*, were *both* of them ſtill *future*, and at the great diſtance of almoſt two centuries) but rather a reſtoration after the captivities of the Iſraelites by Pul and Tiglah; which were already *paſt* at the delivery of this prophecy? this ſeems to be more natural reaſon for Iſaiah's omiſſion here of all prediction of captivity to Babylon, than what the annotator ſuggeſts "that Iſaiah ſuppoſed it in the ſpirit of prophecy," although he did not declare it; for what he has not ſaid we know; but what he only ſuppoſed in his

* "The captivity itſelf of the Jews at Babylon, (which the prophet does not expreſsly foretel, but ſuppoſes in the ſpirit of prophecy, as what was actually to be effected) did not fully take place, till about 130 years after the delivery of this prophecy." *p.* 1.

own mind we are ignorant of: his omiſſion then here to predict expreſſly any *captivity* of the Jews to Babylon, conſpires with the 4th circumſtance mentioned before, in proving that the *delivery* of the Jews here predicted, was prior to any invaſion of Judæa by the Babylonians, the firſt of which was effected by Eſarhaddon, and the ſecond by Nebuchadnezzar. But although Iſaiah has not in *this* prophecy foretold the captivity of the Jews by Nebuchadnezzar, yet has he not done it elſewhere, either before or ſoon afterwards? No, we have no ſufficient evidence, that any of his predictions of calamity to the Jews, refer to the invaſion of Nebuchadnezzar, before the prophecies of this event in the 40th and following chapters: the prediction at the cloſe of the 5th chapter refers, as I have ſhewn, to the Aſſyrian invaſion by Sennacherib only; and another in his 39th chapter, though certainly relative to *ſome* captivity to Babylon or other, yet contains no clear internal evidence concerning which; whether that under Hezekiah's ſucceſſor Manaſſeh, in his 22d year, about the time of Iſaiah's death; or the much more ſevere one under Nebuchadnezzar. It may perhaps with ſome reaſon be preſumed, that Iſaiah meant in this 39th chapter, only the captivity under Manaſſeh; becauſe his words ſeem rather directed againſt

the

the king's own family, than the community; which was the real fact under Manaſſeh*, but not under Nebuchadnezzar; becauſe alſo this calamity predicted under Iſaiah in the 39th chapter, is expreſſly announced there to have been ſent on accout of a fault in Hezekiah; whereas the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar is aſcribed to the idolatry of Manaſſeh†; becauſe moreover the concluding words of Hezekiah, "There ſhall be peace in *my* days," ſeem to imply, that he conceived the calamity denounced would happen ſoon after *his own* death; and laſtly, becauſe it is improbable, that Iſaiah ſhould altogether omit the very firſt captivity of Judah to Babylon, in his own age, by Eſarhaddon, in order to announce another more

* 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11.—"Behold the days ſhall come, that all that is in *thy houſe* ſhall be carried to Babylon—and of *thy ſons* which ſhall iſſue from thee ſhall they take away." *If.* xxxix. 6. Micah, a cotemporary to Iſaiah, has a ſimilar prediction of a captivity of Zion to Babylon, (iv. 10.) which probably related to the very ſame detention of Manaſſeh, at Babylon, and particularly the words, "Is there no king in thee, O daughter of Zion." Both Iſaiah's prophecy in his 39th chapter, and this in Micah, were delivered under Hezekiah, therefore before the captivity of Manaſſeh.

† "Surely at the commandment of the Lord came this upon Judah to remove them out of his ſight for the ſins of Manaſſeh." 2 Kings xxiv. 3.

diſtant one 70 years after his death by Nebuchadnezzar. If then there be no reaſon to think, that any *captivity* of Judah to Babylon, announced by Iſaiah, referred to that by Nebuchadnezzar before his predictions in the 40th chapter; there is the leſs reaſon to preſume, that any *reſtoration* of the Jews, announced by him, had referenee to that event before thoſe in the 40th and following chapters: for any one to preſume otherwiſe, without ſome internal evidence in Iſaiah's words, is the very fault of which we have often had occaſion to complain in the conduct of the commentators; who, through ſuch ill-grounded preſumptions, have introduced diſorder into the arrangement of the prophecies, where there is no evidence that it does actually ſubſiſt. Since the invaſion then by Nebuchadnezzar, and the delivery by Cyrus, are both of them predicted in the 40th and following chapters, and go hand in hand unto the end of the work, I have therefore called theſe chapters the appendix; becauſe they refer to events ſo much later than *any* of the preceding 39 chapters: all thoſe former prophecies were accompliſhed previous to the captivity of Manaſſeh, in his 22d year; and moſt, if not all of them, before Iſaiah's death; but the 40th and following chapters, at full 70, and 140 years

after

after the lateſt of the preceding ones. Iſaiah therefore, with great propriety, placed theſe laſt at the concluſion of his work; and the only confuſion in the arrangement of his work is that, which commentators themſelves have made, by diſtorting his words in an arbitrary manner to ſuch ſenſes, and applying them to ſuch hiſtoric events, as there is no internal evidence or ſufficient reaſon to ſuppoſe were ever in the thoughts or view of the prophet himſelf.

I have now finiſhed every thing, which ſeems neceſſary to explain the nature of this *epiſodical narration*, together with its methodical arrangement and the hiſtoric accompliſhment of the prophecies contained in it from the 6th chapter to the 11th verſe of chapter 17: the right place then of the firſt 5 chapters according to the *order of delivery* would be between the 11th and 12th verſe of chapter 17; nevertheleſs it does not appear, but that the place they occupy at preſent is juſt as natural and proper, and more agreeable to the cuſtomary modes of *poetic* and *oratorical order*; conſequently I have accompliſhed what I propoſed, the vindication of theſe five chapters from being miſplaced; and Iſaiah's work in general from being in diſorder. At the above-mentioned 12th verſe of chap. 17, Iſaiah reſumes the ſame

ſubject of the Aſſyrian invaſion, with which he cloſed his fifth chapter, and he continues that ſeries of prophetic *woes*, which he had begun there, proceeding forward agreeably both to the order of delivery and order of hiſtoric accompliſhment as far as to ch. 39: but to the arrangement of theſe ſubſequent chapters no objections, I think, have ever been made; therefore they ſtand in little need of vindication; however, they may ſuggeſt many intereſting remarks, which at ſome future opportunity I may perhaps include in a ſeparate diſſertation. At preſent I have only to add, that as the gradual progreſs, which has been made in illuſtrating the nature of the prophetic writings of the Jews, tends to remove the objections of free-thinkers to their authenticity, it cannot, I hope, be diſpleaſing to the illuſtrious tranſlator of Iſaiah, that I have been compelled in my purſuit of truth to oppoſe ſome of his principles and opinions, adopted chiefly upon the credit of former commentators; ſince hereby and by the extenſion of ſome of his other principles, I am enabled to make an addition of one important and neceſſary link to the chain of evidence in favour of the Jewiſh prophecies. For it has been long conceived, that theſe prophecies are replete with bold poetic ideas and expreſſions; the

tranſla-

tranſlator, with his uſual learning and accuracy, has convinced the public, that they are even compoſed in a ſimilar metre to the other antient poetic works of the Jews: I have only ventured, in purſuance of his example, to advance one ſtep farther in novelty, by ſhewing, that there are equally good reaſons to conceive theſe prophecies to be alſo put together in a connected method and order, agreeably to ſuch modes of poetic and oratorical arrangement, as were cuſtomary in the moſt antient ages, and this apparently by the reſpective authors of each prophetic work. The moſt antient poems on record were either of an hiſtoric, or a didactic and oratorical kind; but when in later times oratory as well as hiſtory were both of them freed from the conſtraint of metre, they both nevertheleſs retained at firſt conſiderable remains of the nature of poetry with reſpect to arrangement and harmonious elocution: of this the epiſodic, digreſſionary arrangement, as well as poetic diction of Herodotus afford a ſufficient proof and ſpecimen in regard to hiſtory; and, with reſpect to its companion, oratory, we have the information of Ariſtotle that the fact was the very ſame among the moſt antient orators in Greece. "For this reaſon (ſays he) the diction and delivery of the firſt orators was of a poetic kind, as for in-

inſtance in the caſe of Gorgias."* It is only for the truth of the fact itſelf, and not of its cauſe, that I quote the evidence of Ariſtotle here; for as to his διὰ τοῦτο, that is, the cauſe of the fact, in this I muſt differ from him: becauſe he attributes this poetic diction, and delivery of the moſt antient Greek orators, to their profeſſed and artificial imitation of the manner of the Rhapſodiſts and Tragedians; whereas to me it ſeems to have been

* Ἠρξαντο μὲν οὖν κινῆσαι τὸ πρῶτον, ὡσπερ πέφυκεν, οἱ ποιηταὶ—διὸ καὶ αἱ τέχναι συνεστήσαν ἥτε ῥαψῳδικὴ καὶ ἡ ὑποκριτικὴ καὶ ἄλλαι γε· ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ ποιηταὶ λεγοντες ἐνηθη, διὰ τὴν λέξιν ἔδοκουν πορισασθαι τήνδε τὴν δόξαν, διὰ τοῦτο ποιητικὴ πρώτη ἐγενέτο λέξις, οἷον ἡ Γοργίου. Ceperunt quidem movere primum, ut natura tulit poetæ——quam ob rem & artes conſtitutæ ſunt, tum Rhapſodia tum Hiſtorionica tum aliæ; quoniam vero poetæ dicentes inania ex elocutione videbantur comparaſſe hanc gloriam; propterea poetica prima extitit Elocutio, ut Gorgiæ. *Rhetor. l.* 3. 1. Quintilian informs us, that this oldeſt prophane orator Gorgias lived to 109 years (lib. 3. 1.) Pauſanias ſays to 105 only (Eleac. Poſter.) Why then ſhould there be any difficulty to admit, that the ſacred orator Iſaiah fell little ſhort of 100 years? One ſhould think that the only matter of debate can be, whether there were more than 77 years included between the laſt of Uzziah and the capture of Babylon by Eſarhaddon in the 68th Chaldæan year; which, as I have ſhewn, there were not; the antient Jews and Chriſtians having placed the Jewiſh reigns 50 and 20 too ſoon, and even the beſt moderns 3 or 4 years; which ſmall ſum becomes of conſequence, when a life approaches near to 100.

juſt

juſt as natural a relic in oratory, as in hiſtory, of the metrical and poetic mode of all the moſt antient compoſitions in Greece, which ſtill adhered to them after they were reduced to proſe. For juſt as tragedy, when it laid aſide the more antient metre of tetrameter, ſtill retained in its place the ſimpler harmony of iambics, which approached nearer to the nature of proſe in converſation; and juſt as hiſtory in like manner, when it freed itſelf from the bonds of epic metre, ſtill retained a very harmonious arrangement in poetic proſe: ſo alſo it ſeems natural and reaſonable, to attribute the practice of poetic proſe, among the firſt orators, to the ſame cauſe; that of its being a relic of a former practice, rather than as being an innovation, then firſt introduced into oratory through a mere deſire of imitation *. For poetry and harmonious metre are the aſſiſtants to memory in every branch of knowledge, which nature impelled men, in their leſs civilized ſtate, to adopt in all ages and nations, as ſubſtitutes to the art of forming letters, before this latter art had arrived at

* In the late voyages to the South Seas it has been found that the public ſpeakers, or orators appointed by the natives to addreſs themſelves to ſtrangers, ſeem to deliver themſelves in a kind of metre.

maturity;

maturity; and not only as ſubſidiary aſſiſtants to the ſpeaker himſelf, but equally ſo in regard to their effect upon the hearers; by their exerting a natural, and mechanical charm of perſuaſion upon the audience; until men have had opportunity to feel in full force, the ſtill more natural and rational charm, derived from weight of argument, ſupported by ſtrength of diction: juſt as in proſe oratory itſelf, thoſe who have never been witneſſes to the natural graces of manly and elegant elocution, are found readily to take up with its ſubſtitute, the leſs natural mode of florid diction, affected pathos, pretty conceits and antitheſis; in ſhort, with a more artificial noſegay of fulſome flowers, inſtead of the delicate and ſweet breath of nature. The union then in theſe prophetic works of admonitions and exhortations, concerning moral, religious, civil and hiſtoric ſubjects, all delivered in poetic diction, and in a regular and harmonious arrangement of the words, (ſuch as may be properly called metre, notwithſtanding we ſhould remain ignorant of the conſtituent parts of it) but which the more ſubtilizing Greeks, in later ages, ſeparated into ſeveral different ſpecies of compoſition, and adapted to each of them a different, and ſome peculiar mode of ſtructure proper to it; according

cording as it was of a poetic, or of an oratorical, or hiſtoric kind; this aboriginal union, I ſay, here of what was not ſeparated till later ages; and this conſequent mixture of hiſtoric, and chronologic arrangement with poetic and oratorical, inſtead of being, as Le Clerc conceives, an accidental human effect of fragments being collected together in diſorder; or, as Huetius maintained, an intended diſorder, ariſing from the interference of divine inſpiration, does on the contrary, exhibit no other marks of diſorder, than what become at the ſame time marks of the originality, authenticity, and antiquity of theſe works in their preſent form and ſtate. And although indeed the ſuggeſtors of heathen oracles, might perhaps have employed ſome ſimilar poetic modes in their compoſitions; yet this can be no more an objection to the veracity of the Jewiſh prophecies, than that ſacred and profane writers, ſhould both of them uſe in common the ſame language, and the ſame characters, or any common religious practices: or that the Chriſtian Evangeliſts ſhould write in plain unadorned proſe, like the profane hiſtorians of their own age, and not in poetic metre, like the more ancient ones; or in ſome other peculiar manner unknown to the profane hiſtorians of any age whatever.

To reaſon otherwiſe would be to involve ones ſelf in a contradiction, not uncommon indeed among free-thinkers; it would be to blame theſe prophetic works at one moment, for being ſo ſingular and different from other compoſitions of antiquity now remaining, and from ones own chronological ideas of propriety; and yet in the very ſame breath to blame them again, for not being more ſingular: if ſingularity be any recommendation in inſpired writings, theſe of the Jewiſh prophets ſeem to be already ſufficiently poſſeſſed of this advantage. If then to the authenticity, antiquity and veracity, we add moreover the ſingularity, of theſe early efforts in religious and patriotic oratory, there ſeems to be nothing preſerved to us of the firſt ages of human genius, which claims ſo highly the veneration of literary men, as well as the ſacred reverence of Jews and Chriſtians: But at leaſt it appears that the very nature of the diſorder, and other defects imputed to them is ſuch, as can prove nothing more, than that in the age wherein they were writ, the refined ingenuity of men had not then formed thoſe ſyſtematic, and critical rules of art for compoſition, which have ſince been received as laws; and by which free-thinkers pretend now to try, and condemn theſe productions

of

of the Jewiſh prophets, who had the miſfortune to flouriſh many ages before thoſe critical laws were known, or diſcovered. Upon the whole, I preſume, that zealous Chriſtians will be glad thus to find, that there is a firm and ſecure path, which will lead them, with ſafety to their faith, through all the perplexing doubts, ſurmiſes, objections and difficulties, concerning this ſubject, ſtarted by diſputatious men; and that even the literary unbeliever, by being rendered more diſpoſed to admire the human part of theſe prophetic works, is thereby conducted into the beſt path, by which he may be brought to reverence whatever is ſacred and divine in them.

Si quid noviſti, rectius iſtis,
Candidus imperti, ſi non, his utere mecum.

☞ To what has been urged at p. 428, concerning the return of the Iſraelites to Samaria from captivity at Babylon, after Eſarhaddon's capture of it, I have omitted to add, that Uſher, Priddeaux, the Tranſlator and others, have made a quite contrary ſuppoſition; viz. that Eſarhaddon then carried away the laſt remains of the Iſraelites from Samaria, into captivity; (ſee vol. ii. p. 119. and tranſlator's note to Iſaiah, ch. 7. 8.) but this is a mere ſuppoſition, for which there is not the leaſt evidence in ſcripture, Joſephus or Jewiſh traditions, not even of any indirect kind; the invention of it ſeems aſcribed to Uſher, in that note by Dr. Jubb; which is a miſtake, for it is found in Tremellius, (ann. 1587) and ſeems to have been invented on purpoſe to account for the 65 years mentioned in that verſe of Iſaiah, 7. 8. "Temporibus Menaſſæ Eſarchaddon deportavit totas reliquias Iſraelis." *Trem. not. Iſ.* 7. 8.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

Corrections in Vol. II.

See also Page 105.

Page 41. line 7. *for* cotemporary with 15th of May, *read* conumerary with, and the greateſt part of it alſo cotemporary with 15th of May.

44. l. 7. *for* before Chriſt, *r.* after Chriſt.

98. *not. lin. ult.* for 554 *r.* 454.

178. l. 9. *for* of the leaſt, *r.* at the leaſt.

180, l. 18. *for* affected, *r.* effected.

199. l. ante penult. *for* add, *r.* and. l. penul. *for* no, *r.* do.

228. l. penult. *after* all before Ahaz, *add* except the 1ſt chapter.

233. l, 16. *for* ſuppoſe the 7th verſe to be, *r.* ſuppoſe all except the 1ſt chapter to be.

l. 19. *for* conceive it, *r.* conceive them all.

234. *For* concurs with Le'Clerc, *r.* concurs with thoſe who think.

CMC
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM